DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 651 EC 102 676

TITLE Pathways to Employment.
INSTITUTION President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 54p.; Recommendations made during the meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped (Washington, D.C., November 22, 23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Architectural Barriers; Attitudes; Child Advocacy; Conference Reports; Employers; *Employment; Financial Support; *Handicapped; Health Insurance; Instructional Materials; Interagency Cooperation; *Job Placement; Legislation; *Needs Assessment; Parents; Professional Training; Program Planning; Sheltered Workshops; Testing Problems; Unions; *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation; Voluntary Agencies

ABSTRACT

Presented are highlights of the major recommendations offered by over 200 professionals who participated in the National Forum on Pathways to Employment, a meeting on problems relating to the job preparation and placement of handicapped individuals. An initial section lists legislative recommendations, administrative recommendations, recommendations to the education community, and recommendations to the handicapped public. Sections making up the bulk of the document include an issue statement, some questions to consider, delegates' comments, and a table on the barriers along with possible solutions for each of the following areas: financing, personnel preparation, programing, legislation, parents and voluntary health agencies, materials, interagency cooperation, employers, insurance, accessibility, consumerism, testing and evaluation, attitudes, unions and trade associations, and sheltered workshops. Also provided are a list of delegates and a list of planning committee members. (SBH)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED145651

MID-EAST REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER
1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 505
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# pathways to employment

Recommendations made during the Meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped November 22nd & 23rd 1976 Washington, D.C.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bill Eddy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED102676

# Introduction

In late 1976, the Committee on Youth Development of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped sponsored a "National Forum on Pathways to Employment." The purpose of this two day meeting was to bring together local and national leaders from the fields of special education, vocational education, industrial arts, vocational rehabilitation, employment security, sheltered workshops, disabled veterans agencies, employers and handicapped people so that they would have the opportunity to share with one another their problems relating to the job preparation and placement of handicapped people. Together, we believed, a balanced and comprehensive appraisal of the barriers facing the various service providers, employers and handicapped people could be made. Together, with all perspectives present, realistic recommendations would be possible.

This publication contains the views developed by the delegates to the Forum. We offer them in hope that all of us in service to handicapped individuals can benefit from the direction and wisdom they contain

Harold Russell
Chairman

## Acknowledgement

The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped wants to express its appreciation to William Eddy, Mideast Regional Resource Center, Dept. of Special Education, The George Washington University; and to Vance Engleman, Southwest Regional Resource Center, Dept. of Special Education, University of Utah; and to the members of the National Forum Planning Committee for their efforts in the conducting of our "National Forum on Pathways to Employment." The names of the Forum Planning Committee appear in the end.


## Recommendations

These are highlights of the major recommendations offered by over 200 leading professionals from across the nation who participated in the National Forum on Pathways to Employment. Detailed discussion of the issues, barriers and recommendations begins on page 6

**Legislative Recommendations**

1.) New legislative programs must permit innovative local level programs to continue even if they don't precisely coincide with the parameters established by federal or state regulations. The successfulness of a program should be measured by its end results, not by its structure.

2.) Legislative programs should always contain informational or inservice training components (funded) so that local level staffs (state staffs also, in the case of federal legislation) are well briefed on what and how a new legislative program is to operate. Too many well intentioned legislative programs remain "on paper" as a result of inadequately trained staffs at the local and state level.

3.) Legislation must be realistic by providing funding levels that can support the goals a particular piece of legislation attempts to achieve.

4.) Allied legislation must be supportive. (For example, SSI benefits can act as a dissincentive to a handicapped person returning to work.) Our goal should always be employment and related legislation should be tested to insure that it supports that goal.

5.) Legislative accountability in service delivery programs for the handicapped is based on quantity served rather than on the quality of the service. Consequently, agency people are encouraged to serve marginally handicapped clients quickly in order to build-up their numbers served—their measure of success. As a result, quality suffers. Also, under this accountability procedure no credit is given for interagency cooperation (commingling of dollars).

6.) Reverse the trend towards highly specialized and segregated legislative programs for handicapped individuals and begin to mainstream their needs into regular service delivery programs. A good example of this approach is in the Vocational Educational Amendments—P.L. 94-482.

7.) Interagency cooperation is so crucial a factor to job preparation and placement system for the handicapped that all related legislation should foster and reinforce the need for special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation for the benefit of the handicapped child or client. (This cooperation is marked by the commingling of separate agency dollars.)

8.) Research and development in this area lack both dissemination and utilization components. What good is all the innovative and model programming that is being funded unless it reaches the local level? We must provide for these two additional components in all research and development activities.

9.) There is an embarassing dearth of information on the number of handicapped people unemployed, underemployed, being served, not being served, the quality of service, etc. We need better monitoring systems so that we are in a better position to know the problems. Only through this can effective programming be coordinated.

10.) Legislation should require regulations to be written within a certain period of time, provide for expedient appeals procedures, and encourage timely passage of necessary (appropriations) legislation.

11.) Effective second injury fund laws need to be passed in every state. Consideration must be given to a national second injury fund law.

12.) In many job preparation and placement programs for handicapped individuals, funding is contingent upon federal monies being secured. Much of this money is "soft" money. This causes serious continuity problems and an attitude of uncertainty on the part of government officials. Federal legislation must recognize these negative factors and develop programming that allows on-going services to continue and mandate the local agencies to serve handicapped people routinely just as they serve all others.

13.) Legislation should be developed that provides wage supplements to sheltered workshop clients. Presently, many sheltered workshops are unable to pay minimum wages because of the training dimensions of the work. Productivity is below normal levels during the training phases and for those clients who need a long-term sheltered employment environment. Wage supplements would enable sheltered workshops to continue to serve severely handicapped clients and would insure that these clients receive a minimum wage.

**Administrative Recommendations**

1.) Interagency cooperation or coordination is imperative if we are ever to make our nation's job preparation and placement system for handicapped people truly effective. Federal, state and local level cooperation among special education, vocational rehabilitation and vocational education is the key. (Consider also sheltered workshops, employment security and the Veterans Administration.) This cooperation must foster the concept of commingling dollars for the benefit of the handicapped individual. Service delivery must learn to become child or client centered.

2.) Existing communications among related agencies is inadequate. Leadership or commitment from the top must be visible before various agency people will concentrate sufficiently on communicating with related agencies and those they serve.

3.) We must monitor, more closely, developments in the world of work and modify programs so they reflect current job market trends. We must involve employers, union officials, handicapped people and their parents in programming.

4.) Better reporting procedures must be established so that we know the unemployment rate, underemployment rate, numbers of handicapped people being served, not being served, etc., so that we can modify services to meet current needs.

5.) All administrators in this service area must be aware of and comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as well as other legislative mandates (P.L. 90-480, State Architectural Barriers Laws, P.L. 94-142 and P.L. 94-482). This means that *all* programming must have, built in, the capacity to serve handicapped people.

6.) Each service agency in regular education, vocational education, and industrial arts should have at least one or two persons on board their respective staffs whose sole job is to develop and promote programming for handicapped people within the agency's programs.

7.) We need local, state and national level conferences on significant problems on the education, training, counseling and placement of the handicapped people. The corner stone to these regular meetings should be interdisciplinary deliberations. This will help professionals to become better informed about the problems that exist throughout the job preparation and placement system. This format will also encourage interagency cooperation.

8.) The handicapped consumer movement must be seen as an exceedingly healthy phenomenon. It is not a threat to those professionals providing adequate services. Professionals should strive to understand this movement, encourage its growth and support it actively.

9.) Tests, evaluations and admittance procedures must be scrutinized to insure that they fairly and accurately measure the potentials of handicapped people to succeed in training programs. Subtle discriminatory dimensions should be understood and guarded against by all.

10.) Efforts should be mounted to educate non-handicapped students concerning the disabilities and the potentials handicapped people possess. This will promote, through understanding and awareness, acceptance of handicapped students in the regular education process.

11.) The "cost-effectiveness" of programming for handicapped populations must be viewed by administrators in a wider and long-term context. Administrators must strive to answer the question: "Is it more cost-effective to serve handicapped individuals now with effective education, training, counseling and placement services or spend future tax dollars on their public assistance and institutionalization?" Further, administrators must recognize that a dollar spent on training and placing handicapped workers can return ten to twenty times that amount from the revenues collected from their earned income.

12.) Administrators, particularly state and local administrators, must not be misled to believe that programming for handicapped populations is contingent upon outside funding sources (i.e. monies from the federal government for education and rehabilitation or special grants for services to handicapped individuals). While the federal share and involvement seems to be increasing, the responsibility of providing services to these people remains on the state and local level.

**Recommendations to the Education Community**

1.) The gap between regular programs (education, training, counseling and placement) and special programs for handicapped people must be drastically narrowed by introducing all preservice and inservice personnel to the needs of handicapped individuals. Special education vis-a-vis regular education, vocational educaton vis-a-vis vocational rehabilitation, placement vis-a-vis selective placement professionals are all too far apart in their professional training programs, professional societies and respective agencies. Consequently, at least three curriculum adjustments must be made in institutions of higher education and at public and private agencies and institutions.

First, teacher education and counseling preparation programs need to view people with handicaps as individuals and as people from the population they serve.

Second, teachers should have the ability to deal with behaviors that each and every (including handicapped) individual manifests.

Third, curriculum development should be based on a cross-programming approach so that related disciplines are understood.

2.) In the area of services to handicapped people, professionals must be made aware of and accept their responsibility to be advocates for the needs and rights of those they serve.

3.) All professionals in this area must be made aware of the myths and misconceptions that non-handicapped people hold against handicapped people, so that they can guard against them (i.e. the "charity syndrome").

4.) We must be continually aware of new career options for handicapped individuals by monitoring the world of work more closely. We must pass this information on to other professionals through our preservice and inservice training programs.

5.) Regular tests and evaluations must be modified so that they do not discriminate against handicapped students. Those administering these tests must be thoroughly trained on how to administer them fairly to handicapped students.

6.) Professionals seem to lack a consensus on what skills are needed for job preparation and placement services personnel. This not only causes a problem with certification procedures but is also causing professionals to vary in their requirements of ability from region to region.

**Recommendations to the Handicapped Public**

1.) Self-confidence and career aspirations are sometimes lower than they should be among handicapped people and their parents. This low expectation can cause an overall reduction in the demand for education, training, counseling and placement services for handicapped people. Reduced demand results in reduced supply of these services. Increased contact by disabled children and their parents with other handicapped people will serve to increase awareness of the opportunities that are possible for handicapped individuals. Before services in this area get better, in both quantity and quality, demand for improvement in the job preparation and placement services for handicapped individuals must increase.

2.) Handicapped people should become a more unified minority. Too often the groups representing the blind, or deaf or mentally retarded or physically handicapped, etc., look out only for the interest of their disability category.

3.) Better understanding must evolve between handicapped consumer organizations and professionals serving handicapped people. An adversary relationship could eventually develop which would be most unfortunate. Each one of us, professionals and handicapped persons alike, must strive to understand the others perspective, responsibilities, limitations, needs. etc. Each of us must respect the expertise or experiences of the other.

4.) Parents of disabled children and handicapped people must develop a political force at the local, state and national level by joining regular groups (such as the PTA, school boards, NEA, AVA, etc.) as well as groups representing handicapped people and their parents.

Guild Needs
Automation / Non-Personal Service
Changing Technology
Staff & Time Available
Numbers Game"
Staff Training (State &
Evaluation of Client Services

Employers

# Financing Programs

**Issue Statement:**
One of the biggest barriers to the development of vocational, educational and industrial arts training programs for handicapped people is a lack of funding. The rational is that it is more "cost-effective" to expend existing resources on the greatest number of people possible and on those who will benefit the most—that is to say, on nonhandicapped students.

Handicapped people don't accept this rationale. They counter "the lack of money" excuse by reminding local and state education and training agency officials that their mandate requires them to serve the general public—including handicapped people—with their programs. If any amount of public funds, no matter how small, are to be spent on public education and training programs then, those programs must be designed to serve handicapped people.

In recent years, federal expenditures to the states for special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation for the handicapped have been steadily increasing. While this larger federal share has been in response to a genuine financial need, local and state officials may be reacting to this involvement as a signal from the federal government for a basic shift in responsibility of providing these services from the state level to the federal level. However, states have the ultimate responsibility for providing education and training services to their citizens.

Increased federal "contribution" to state programs for handicapped people ought to encourage states to fulfill their responsibilities to handicapped people; not to discourage them from doing so; and, not to foster an attitude that seeks federal funds before programming can begin.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. Upon what rationale do administrators base a denial (for financial reasons) of academic, prevocational, vocational, industrial arts, work-study, job placement and training services to handicapped students?

B. How do we answer the charge that "we can't afford" education and training programs for handicapped people? What about when these expenditures are balanced against future local government costs for institutionalization, public assistance programs, and lost revenues from potential earnings?

C. Who has ultimate responsibility for the education and training of handicapped people? How do we balance this responsibility with the legitimate financial needs of the states?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning "Cost-Effectiveness". . .
. . . Education and training programs for any group (handicapped or not), are never cost-effective in the short-run. They must be viewed over the long-haul. Handicapped people possess a greater potential for economic drain if they are not given the training and education necessary to become self-sufficient. Non-producing handicapped people can require that public expenditures be made for institutionalization, public assistance, SSI, lost revenues from potential earnings, etc. It would, therefore, seem reasonable to make a case demonstrating that it is, in fact, more "cost-effective" to educate and train handicapped individuals . . .

Concerning the obligation to serve . . .
. . . Traditionally, legally and morally the local education agency (LEA) is expected to assume the ultimate responsibility for educating and training children. Since providing such services to children who are handicapped often costs more per pupil and may require "special" programming, LEA's tend to react by spending less effort and money on this segment of the population. Regardless, it remains their responsibility to serve handicapped children. Legislation (P.L. 94-142, Section 504, Rehabilitation Act 1973) and court cases support this fact. Therefore, it is no longer a point to be debated. It's the law and failure to comply is criminal. . .

Concerning outside funding . . .
. . . In recognition of the limited resources (tax based) of local and state education agencies, federal dollars are coming back to help serve the handicapped children. Additionally, other agencies such as state divisions of vocational rehabilitation have funds for developing the employment skills of handicapped youths. All these funds came from the states, all are allocated to serve handicapped people. We (agency people) must overcome our possessiveness of these funds and keep in mind the ultimate goal that these funds are to achieve—the education and training of handicapped people. This person or child-centered outlook should foster an interagency cooperation and commingling of dollars necessary to get the job done . . .

Other comments concerning financing programs . . .
. . . Federal funding has tended to be "soft" money in this area causing serious continuity problems at local levels. There must be some positions taken to commit federal funds on an ongoing basis. The federal government has, in the past, had a "concern" role, the state a "responsibility" role and the local a "functions" role. The federal government can't be "responsibly concerned" without appropriating funding for the local agencies to implement the sometimes unreasonable demands of "concern" and "responsibility."

. . . We must begin to think in terms of program components if we are ever to provide a comprehensive program to provide employment security for the handicapped through education and training. These components can be provided by using existing resources through interagency cooperation. For example, vocational education. vocational rehabilitation would accept the component of job training. Special education would accept the component of career awareness. Industrial arts would provide the pre-vocational component. . .

. . . Our current SSI and SSDI systems discourage employment. This problem must be resolved and corrected. Health care, insurance, housing and transportation are costly items to a handicapped person who must forfeit SSI and SSDI when beginning a job. . .

. . . Availability of outside funding is always controlled by political groups and/or separate agencies. Most agencies insist that schools apply "matching" funds with these funds being spent per guidelines. This not only limits the use of the local's funds but also takes control of them out of their hands and into the hands of another agency. . .

# Financing

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| A lack of clear, concise interpretation of complex laws and regulations for local level staffs and clients (handicapped people). | When legislation and/or funding is initiated, there must be built-in training programs for local level staffs and awareness programs for handicapped people, to insure proper and complete interpretation. | In service programs to train staff in the meaning, intent and specifics of the regulations<br>Mandate appropriations for in-service training.<br>Appropriate dissemination to client population (handicapped people)<br>Legislation to incorporate these ideas. | Congress and state legislature |
| Conflicting and contradictory regulations. | Interagency cooperation for greater communications and understanding of each agency's role and existing regulations. | Monitor all agency programs and review all proposed programs and legislation to eliminate conflicts and duplications in regulations.<br>Establish a central agency to coordinate services to handicapped people. | Office of Management and Budget<br>Congressional Budget Office |
| No reward for local initiative. | There should be established an allowance for local initiative in developing programs that have been established without federal or state guidelines and/or dollars. | Consideration should be given to all new and existing federal and state programs that allow the continuation of existing innovative and productive programming that does not necessarily conform to federal and state guidelines. | All federal and state agencies |
| Inconsistency among state (and federal) government in funding and staffing various state (federal) controlled service agencies/programs serving handicapped people. | Develop a cooperative agreement between all state agencies who have an impact on handicapped individuals.<br><br>Establish a coordinating agency for the handicapped in each state to oversee all services to the handicapped and monitor them for effectiveness. | A written document or contract signed by each department head and the governor to cooperate in delivery of services to the handicapped.<br>A federal mandate with federal support and state matching requirements<br>Congress should enact legislation and establish a "Bureau of the Handicapped." | Governor's office and Congress |
| Lack of uniformity in monitoring the use of funds. | Establish a uniform and consistent method of monitoring funding at local level. | Devise a system of local agency heads signing - off expenditures and reporting to a central state office. | State education agency and other state departments |
| Funds limited in proportion to need. | Realistic funding of legislation. Abandon practice of promising full-service in legislation but delivering less in appropriation. For example, amend Voc Ed Act so that voc. ed. services can be delivered to handicapped people. | Intensify lobbying efforts for handicapped, by handicapped. | Organization of handicapped and other concerned groups |
| Financial disincentives to work—loss of federal benefits (SSI and Medicaid) | Restructuring of existing laws, i.e., SSA (Social Security Act) to eliminate overwhelming disincentives to those under these programs seeking employment. Employment should always be our goal — not maintenance. | Develop lobbying efforts in this area for handicapped, by handicapped. | Organization of handicapped and other concerned groups |
| Problems of measuring quality of services vs. quantity of services as related to accountability. | Agency success rates for D.V.R., Vocational Ed, Employment Service and similar groups must be measured by criteria other than case closure, placements, etc. (in short, stop playing numbers game). These accounting systems serve agencies not people. | All agencies (D.V.R., Voc Ed, Employment Security, etc.) must rethink their reasons for quotas, for funding and look instead at the quality of services rendered and develop a system of accountability which includes provisions for desperately needed follow-up of client. | Agency leaders, congressional committees, governors, state legislators |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Monies are too categorical, fragmenting service delivery. | Monies for all programs designed to serve the needs of handicapped people must be allocated on the basis of need – not to perpetuate a program (more flexibility in funding). | Interagency cooperation is imperative. This includes funding flexibility that allows for the commingling of dollars so that needs are met with existing resources. When needs change funding must be capable of shifting to meet needs | Agency heads, state and federal legislators |
| Lack of effective management contributes to costly and frustrating paper work. | Stricter personnel requirements for top-level positions in all areas of service delivery to handicapped population. | Eliminate political appointments Strict adherence to performance requirements for positions (with intent being to thus eliminate unnecessary administrative waste.) | Personnel offices, governors President and law makers |
| Lack of agreement among service delivery areas (including community & recipients) of where responsibility lies for policy and funding. | Define balance among federal, state and local level agencies; clearly define who does what with how much. | Legislators, chief executives must coordinate missions of related agencies. | Legislators, handicapped lobbyists |

# Personnel Preparation

**Issue Statement:**
In general, our complex and technical society has created the need for highly specialized occupations. Medical, legal, scientific and administrative fields have all witnessed a proliferation of specialization. The education, training and placement professions are no different.

By way of responding to the variety of education, training and placement needs that exist, personnel preparation programs for these professions have accepted the traditional approach that encourages specialization. While this approach responds to the need for detailed training in a given area it tends to cause a wider degree of separation in allied professions than might be expected or desired. For instance, special education and vocational rehabilitation are, basically, education, training and placement professions serving people who have disabilities. The trend towards specialization has caused the business of teaching, training and placing handicapped people to fall squarely on the shoulders of experts on special education and vocational rehabilitation.

The impression that has been created by the need for these specialties is that only professionals with these specialties are capable of serving handicapped people in education, training and placement programs. The final consequence of this impression is that it leads regular education training and placement professionals to conclude that they aren't "qualified" to teach handicapped people. Therefore, they cannot admit handicapped students into their programs.

However, only in certain situations is it necessary to depend solely on special education or vocational rehabilitation for meeting the education, training and placement needs of handicapped people. In many other cases, regular education, training and placement professionals could effectively serve handicapped people in their programs.

In order to make this fact more widely acceptable the advocates and others suggest that all regular courses in education, counseling, training and placement in the universities and elsewhere incorporate units of study dealing with disabling conditions, so that these professionals will feel "qualified" to serve handicapped people with their expertise.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. To what extent are special education and vocational rehabilitation different from regular education, vocational education, industrial arts and regular placement? When are handicapped people capable of functioning in "regular" education, training and placement programs? What are special education and vocational rehabilitation's responsibilities in this area? What are regular education, training and placement professional's responsibilities in this area?

B. What kinds of curriculum adjustments are necessary to enable regular education training and placement professionals to serve handicapped people? In the universities? Elsewhere?

C. Would this shift be viewed as being threatening to either professional groups ("regular" - "special")? Why? How can we meet these fears?

D. What are the advantages/disadvantages of specialization in these fields? How can we balance the need for specialization with the exclusivity of related professionals and agencies that it breeds?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the relationship of special education and vocational rehabilitation with regular education, vocational education and industrial arts . . .

. . . All these disciplines and agencies should have the same common goal for their clients—employment and self-fulfillment (vocational as well as avocational). Their strategy for service delivery should be generic; that is, develop individualized programs based upon the client's needs and interests. The role of special education and vocational rehabilitation should be to supplement and to support regular education, vocational education and industrial arts . . .

Concerning the need for curriculum changes:
. . . At least three curriculum changes appear necessary. First, regular teacher education and counseling training programs need to view people with handicaps as individuals, as part of the general population. Second, teachers should be able to deal with behaviors that each and *every* (including handicapped) individual manifests. Third, curriculum should be based on a cross-programming approach so that related disciplines are understood. These changes should take place in higher education and at public and private agencies and institutions. . .

Concerning the advantages of specialization. . .
. . . The advantages are: 1.) depth and specificity of knowledge; 2.) awareness of all resources; 3.) professional commitment; 4.) status, prestige and ego satisfaction that comes with "expertise" not generally shared; 5.) special funding of research and service delivery. . .

Concerning the disadvantages of specialization. . .
. . . The disadvantages are: 1.) handicapped become a separate concern; 2.) professionals tend to have a narrower perspective; 3.) rivalries or competitiveness develops between related disciplines; 4.) professionals have less knowledge and scope and, 5.) related disciplines grow separately, not always together.

Concerning the need to bring regular services closer to special services. . .
. . . In order to develop a balance between the advantages and disadvantages of separating regular education and vocational education from special education and vocational rehabilitation we need to: 1.) develop pre-service teacher preparation programs that prepare regular teachers to teach students with a wider range of abilities; and 2.) bring together under the control of one administrative force both "regular" programs and "special" programs. . .

# Personnel Preparation

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| A non-supportive attitude by chief administrators for the education, training and placement of handicapped populations. | That the views of administrators be broadened to increase their understanding of the needs of handicapped students and their responsibility to serve this segment of the population just as they serve all others. | Administrator must be aware of the mandates of the new legislation through public hearings and related information. The administrators must apply new knowledge and resources to the educational needs of the handicapped. | The state education agency will provide leadership and resources to the local education agency (specifically the LEA director). |
| Identification of available and appropriate funding source by local service provider. | Do a survey of federal, state and local units to identify funding sources. | From all possible sources sort out those that are free of restrictions that might constrain rather than enhance the program. | All units or agencies. |
| Existing certification standards may be irrelevant or may vary from state to state | Develop nationally recognized standards for teacher preparation and certification. | Groups need to come together to develop mutually agreeable standards. | National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. |
| Need to train existing staffs and all new regular education, vocational education and industrial art teachers on how to serve handicapped people. | All teachers must be exposed to the problems and needs of the handicapped in order to foster good attitudes in all types of teachers. | Funding must be allocated for inservice and preservice training to provide opportunities for teachers of all disciplines to become aware of the needs of handicapped people. | All appropriate government levels. |
| Existing paraprofessional and professional training programs lack a consensus or common acceptance of competencies which should be achieved. | Understand that a competency is a performance-based, measurable statement of observable outcomes. Trainees must identify a set of generic competencies needed by personnel in all related fields. Individual disciplines within a field will then require the development of additional sub-competencies unique to their specific tasks. A planning model, such as this Forum, might be considered as a schematic. | A "transguild" task force should be formed to define and agree on the universal competencies. Each contributing service area and sub-area should then develop supporting skill competencies for their special task needs. Certification of professionals and paraprofessionals would be based on the demonstration of these competencies. | The catalyst for this process might be the President's Committee or U.S. Office of Education. |
| Lack of training for secondary special education teachers in career education, prevocational education, vocational education and on "how to" interface with these professionals. | Incorporate career education, and vocational education skills in special education preservice and inservice training. | Curriculum adjustments. | Universities, state education agencies, local education agencies, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |
| Attitudes<br>A.) General Public<br>1. apathy<br>2. lack of advocates<br>B.) Employees<br>1. apathy<br>2. lack of advocates<br>3. emphasis on disability<br>C.) Professional Educators<br>1. apathy<br>2. lack of advocates<br>3. specialization<br>4. limited staff integration<br>5. perception that only special education and rehab. should teach & counsel hand. people<br>6. roles of paraprofessionals and professionals not well defined<br>7. emphasis on disability | Conferences which bring educators, general public, community agency personnel and employees together should be conducted. Emphasis should be placed on the abilities of handicapped people.<br>Legislation should be developed which requires inter and intra agency program development, coordination and funding.<br>Certification requirements should be reviewed to insure multidisciplinary competencies related to the education of and services for handicapped people.<br>Competencies commonly needed for working with handicapped people should be developed for all educators. | Begin a series of conferences (similar to this one) at national level and continue on down to state and local level.<br>Develop "transguild" legislation, as opposed to isolated or specialized legislation, that serves the needs of handicapped people along with other people.<br>Set certification requirements according to the inter-disciplinary competencies needed by all educators to adequately serve the handicapped.<br>Research, needs assessments and program evaluation must be done at all levels of education and in all disciplines to identify those competencies. | Education, rehab. services, other community service agencies (at all levels) and private business.<br>National and state governments.<br>State departments of education and higher education.<br>Higher education, state depts. of education, rehabilitation, labor, commerce, and various researchers. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Attitudes (continued) | Develop models for providing services to the handicapped through the use of diversified staff (including educators and community service personnel). | In order to adequately serve the handicapped it is essential that a diversified staff be employed, including paraprofessionals. Models for the effective use of diversified staffing, including job descriptions, education, training and responsibilities, must be developed and field tested. | Higher education, state depts. of education, rehabilitation, labor, commerce and various researchers. |
| Lack of training in vocational rehabilitation on how to serve junior and senior high school age population in special centers. | Include instructions on how to serve school age population for rehabilitation professionals in their pre-service and inservice training. | Curriculum adjustments and training. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, universities and the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. |
| Bureaucratic systems tend to fragment services, causing duplication and failure to provide adequate and appropriate services and creating minimal program accountability. Various factors (e.g. empire building, agency survival, protection of turf) make it counter productive for personnel in agencies to give up and cooperatively share power and responsibility. | Need to define the goals of education and, in turn, personnel preparation in specific and performance terms. One major goal is to prepare the handicapped individual to reach his or her maximum potential as a productive and self-sufficient citizen not to place a person in a meaningless temporary job. Agencies serving the handicapped (e.g. university training programs, certification offices, education agencies, training agencies, placement agencies) must give up and/or share power and responsibility if the handicapped are to reach their potential through effective education and training. | At the inservice and preservice training levels, teach professionals to insure that students understand the goals of their profession and the pitfalls of bureaucracy. This means continuous evaluation of curriculum and experiences to provide a relevant education. | University preparation programs. Funding agencies and advocacy groups. |
| Lack of a national direction or commitment in delivery of services to handicapped people which results in a lack of state and local level direction and commitment. | Inherent in recent federal legislation, PL 94-142 and PL 94-482, is the notion of inter-agency cooperative planning. In order to obtain maximum utilization of the legislative intent and subsequent funding resources, top priority must be given to joint planning and implementation efforts. Those federal agencies responsible for the implementation and monitoring of the above legislation would do well to demonstrate, to their constituents, their commitment to the cooperative planning concept via personal example, rules and regulations and funding patterns. | Funding priorities should be given to those institutions and agencies that demonstrate a commitment to interagency planning. This should include those preparation and inservice training programs which emphasize and demonstrate cooperative planning.<br>Federal agencies should act in a cooperative manner when designing services. | U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor |
| Research and development. Lack of dissemination of information. | Devise a communication coordination and dissemination structure that cuts across agency lines so that a consolidated information system would be available to the practitioner in education, training and placement of handicapped individuals. | Develop a policy committee at the federal, state and local levels that would have binding powers on all related agencies and would monitor the distribution materials to the front line providers of services. This Committee should also strive to develop a unified philosophical and financial system among related agencies. | The Congress and the President at the federal level. The state legislature and the governor at the state level. And, the city council and the mayor at the local level. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Research and development. Lack of dissemination of information. (Continued) | Realign funding patterns so as to restructure the country's educational system in such a way as to insure that all children are served in the least restrictive alternative. | Full funding of P.L. 94-142, P.L. 94-482 and other related programs. Better monitoring by using Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Vocational Education Amendments. | U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Congress. State Education Agencies. |
| General communication among related education training and placement agencies are poor. | Improve communications among all professionals and agencies who deal with the handicapped to:<br>a. increase and improve comprehensive programming at federal, state and local level;<br>b. provide for an integrated personnel development program;<br>c. insure direction and common goals in professional education;<br>d. increase cooperative efforts among professionals and related departments; and,<br>e. improve leadership in professional organizations. | Legislation and/or state leadership should mandate that personnel preparation programs (for all educators and other professionals) be comprehensively planned and have communication line established for continuous cooperation and growth.<br>National pre and inservice training models should be developed for all educators which will provide for proper cooperative understanding and communications among related professionals in service to handicapped people,<br>Federal and state agencies should be models of cooperation for local agencies. | Legislators at all levels.<br>Agency heads at all levels.<br>Consumer and parent lobby groups.<br>Professional organizations. |

# Programming

**Issue Statement:**
School administrators have traditionally developed academic and vocational programs that are designed to accommodate the "average" student's needs, interests and abilities. The reason for this approach is that by directing programs to the "average" student a reasonable extension of low-level and high-level interests, abilities and skills can also be accommodated. Further, management of large numbers of students is made possible by small numbers of teachers in reasonably sized units, costing moderate amounts of money. And, lastly, this approach permits the utilization of standarized curricula which helps to insure a more uniform quality of education.

Unfortunately, handicapped students' needs, interests and abilities are usually considered to fall outside of the "normal" range of people being served by regular education, vocational education, and industrial arts, counseling and job placement. As a result, they usually do not benefit from the extensive public education, training and placement system that exists in our country for almost everybody else. Handicapped's pathway to employment is primarily through special education and vocational rehabilitation.

Because handicapped people must depend upon a separate system they do not have job preparation and placement services equal to that of nonhandicapped people. Dissatisfied with a separate and unequal situation, and aware that survival in the community will have to be accomplished in an integrated setting, they are challenging the validity of the "normal" range instructional concept, as it applies to them.

They believe that reasonable accommodations to educational and technical programs can be made that will permit participation of a large number of handicapped students. This movement is not all-inclusive. Special services have their function. However, educators and other service providers are being asked to consider wider range of regular services, so that those handicapped people who are capable of benefiting from them, will have the chance to do so.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. How can the needs of managers for an "average range" of students in the education, training and placement services be balanced against the desire of handicapped people to gain access?

B. Could the "average range" be redefined to include those handicapped people who are capable of benefiting from regular ed and voc ed? What kinds of "reasonable accommodations" would have to be made?

C. What would be the role of special education and vocational rehabilitation if this change were to occur? How would "special" services compliment "regular" services that served handicapped people?

D. What would be the impact of this restructuring on the nonhandicapped students? What would it cost in terms of manpower and resources?

E. How does existing legislation effect this issue (Sec 503, Sec 504 of the Rehab Act of 1973, P.L. 94-142, P.L. 94-482)?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the "average range" instructional concept. . .
. . . Programs should use this concept only to determine where the individual is in relation to the scale of development, not as a form of categorization.

. . . All teachers need to become competent to work with individual students of varying ability levels rather than molding the individual student into an average group. Individualized instruction based on ability would help handicapped students in a regular education or vocational education program.

. . . The desire and needs of handicapped people to gain access to "regular" programs is a high priority item. Restructuring education programs by use of support staff and individualized instruction should not adversely affect the nonhandicapped student, in fact, he/she should grow from the experience.

# Programs

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Attitudes of handicapped persons toward self may be low, resulting in low expectations and reduced demand for education, training and placement services. | Increase self-concept by more contact with non-handicapped world. Schools must not be permitted to create or foster the impression that handicapped child is inferior to others. | Inclusion of the child in regular programs. Move away from separate programs and systems for handicapped people. | Legislators, handicapped advocacy groups, education agencies. |
| Architectural and transportation barriers. | Enforce, encourage, and support barrier free design laws and concepts. | Total commitment. Enforcement of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, P.L. 94-142, P.L. 94-482 and P.L. 90-480. | Everyone's responsibility. |
| Regular teachers' lack of interest or skills to serve handicapped children. | Improve preservice and inservice training to make teachers aware of their responsibilities and develop the skills necessary to serve handicapped children. | Administrative mandates, certification and funded programs. | Colleges, professional societies, school agencies. |
| Restrictions on funds coming into the states from the federal level inhibit innovative programming. | Must allow locals to determine their needs and apply resources accordingly. | More latitude in regulations. | Federal agencies with funding authority. |
| Lack of empirical evidence on what techniques and methods are best for teaching individual learners with disabilities. | We need basic research to determine and validate which techniques and methods of instruction are best. This should include a review of model programs to determine the elements necessary for success. | Redirect funding from the development of new materials to evaluation of existing materials and the documentation and dissemination of successful programs. | U.S. Office of Education, State Education agencies and Rehabilitation Services Administration. |
| Lack of guidelines for adequate service delivery. | Federal government should show commitment to its goals. | The federal government should set an example by establishing service goals and meeting them. | Congress and Executive branch. |
| Lack of information about future job market. | Need to do research and disseminate information on new jobs/careers, information on how to train for these occupations. | Closer ties with industry. | Federal and state job preparation and placement agencies. |
| Inadequate counseling services. | Develop a staff position that enables an agency to provide a life-time of counseling services to handicapped people. This would provide follow up care. | Within existing agencies a job description should be developed to bring this expertise abroad. | U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Department of Labor, appropriate state agencies. |
| Lack of awareness, commitment and solid planning by all legislatures regarding the needs of handicapped people. | All handicapped consumers, parents, and advocacy groups make legislatures aware of the needs of handicapped people for education, vocational education, rehabilitation, industrial arts training. And the need for coordinated planning and service delivery. | National consumer and advocacy groups should become aware of the issues in these areas and broadcast these problems to state and local affiliates. Pressure should be consistent on legislatures and demands uniformity. | National consumer groups, voluntary health agencies, national advocacy groups. |
| Lack of information on the quantity and quality of education and training services for handicapped people. | Educational and vocational program planning data should be collected through a national data system which has uniform definitions and contains information which is specifically appropriate for the evaluation and development of training, education and placement programs for handicapped people. | Local service delivery personnel should meet regularly to collect this data after federal and state leadership have mandated its collection. It should be collected quarterly and transmitted to the legislatures. | All service delivery professionals, legislatures, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Department of Labor, employers, teacher trainers. |
| Lack of commitment to enforce existing legislation. | Governmental agencies should not hesitate to actively enforce the sanctions in existing legislation and regulations. | More careful selection of agency leadership and commitment from agency leaders and legislation. Clarify noncompliance conditions and publicize them. | Congress, Executive Branch. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of awareness of consumers, parents, educators and the general public regarding legislated opportunities for handicapped people | Increase dissemination of information regarding legislations and regulations. | Include funding for publicity campaigns, including use of media. | Public information program officers in federal agencies. |
| Lack of consistent interpretation of the regulations and other directives by different agencies providing services to the handicapped. | Coordination of related agencies providing education, training and placement services for handicapped people. | Office of Management and Budget should demand agency coordination and cooperation at federal level.<br>National leadership coordinating conferences should be sponsored.<br>Congress should further consider and review the concept of the Allied Service Act whereby categorical funds could be blended together to provide full services at the local level. | Office of Management and Budget.<br>Rotated responsibility among Employment Service, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Vocational Education, Social Security. |
| Cost-benefit rationale is still being used for program assessment, resulting in inadequate human service programs. | Utilize management techniques that have goals and objectives defined in terms of human's needs. | Reconceptualize or better understand the purpose of the human service delivery system and develop an evaluation system that focuses on the individual being served. | All human service delivery system. |
| Lack of understanding and cooperation among disciplines and agencies in providing career education for handicapped persons. | Form an advisory committee consisting of representatives from each agency/discipline to foster and coordinate the delivery of career education to the handicapped. | Each level of administration should establish this type of committee and give it authority. | Federal, state and local administrators. |
| The concept of "handicapped" blocks the formation of positive attitudes and handicaps the handicapped. | Get away from the connotation of handicapped. Think more in terms of qualifiable/qualified. | Be more careful with publicity that fosters the "charity" syndrome that surrounds the world of the handicapped. | Handicapped people; organizations of, for and by the handicapped. |
| Lack of trained personnel, adequate facilities and industry involvement in training and education programs for the handicapped. | Move away from separate programming and open regular programs to handicapped students with financial assistance to make this work. | Legislative and administrative mandates. | All levels of administration. |
| Lack of "hard evidence" that industrial arts and vocational education are serving handicapped people. | LEA's must report, by handicapping condition, grade level or age, sex, what type of training and skills are being given. | Junior, senior and post-secondary schools report to LEA who, in turn reports to SEA who should incorporate the information into their state plans. GAO investigate results. | All levels of administration. |
| Failure of Civil Service Commission and Rehabilitation Services Administration (plus state office of vocational rehabilitation) to include special education students with learning disabilities under their programs for handicapped individuals. | Include learning disabled persons in the handicapped programs. | Understand what learning disability is. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, Civil Service Commission and the State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. |

# Legislation

**Issue Statement:**
Over the last several years, state and federal governments have been enacting laws designed to protect the rights of handicapped people. These laws were passed in response to unfair or unequal treatment afforded to handicapped people by the community in matters of access, employment, education and training. These laws were designed to correct injustices.

In some instances, however, the implementation of legislation designed to assure the rights of a handicapped minority has caused a hardship to be endured by others. Some people may even argue that in several of these instances the rights of the majority have given way to the rights of the handicapped minority.

A most notable example of this dichotomy exists in the area of architectural barriers legislation. All fifty states and the Congress have passed laws that require any new building or facility, constructed in whole or part with federal or state funds, must be made accessible to physically handicapped people. When transgressors are prosecuted for failure to comply with the applicable architectural barriers legislation, courts have, on occassion, reacted by barring all others from the use of the facility until full compliance with the law is achieved. The most celebrated example of this procedure is the closing down of a subway station to all citizens because it lacked accessible features for some handicapped citizens (Washington Urban League, et al vs. WMATA).

Other examples of handicapped minority rights impinging upon the rights of others have occurred as a result of both Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Section 503 calls for employers with federal contracts of $2500 or more to take affirmative action to hire and advance qualified handicapped workers. The need to provide handicapped people with legislative protection from discrimination in employment has developed new responsibilities for employers. New reporting procedures; accommodations at the work site; and new grievance procedures all add up to an increased work load and cost for many employers. In addition, some fear that because new pressures are going to be exerted to hire qualified handicapped people, other, equally qualified applicants may lose out because they are not handicapped.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act carries an even greater burden particularly for the education and training professions. This Section prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicap in any program or activity receiving federal financial support. Draft regulations call for complete program accessibility within one year, and physical or architectural accessibility within three years. The cost for compliance will have to be borne by program administrators.

Most people would agree that handicapped people have the right to use public buildings and facilities; to seek employment without fear of discrimination; and to be able to enter, on the basis of ability, any public education and training program they wish. The problem or issue arises when these rights create hardship upon the rights or responsibilities of others.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. To what extent should we tolerate an assertion of the rights of the minority (handicapped people) to impinge upon the rights of the majority?

B. Is it fair to "punish" the general public and others for lack of compliance of existing legislation designed to protect the rights of handicapped people? In the area of architectural barriers legislation? In the area of affirmative action? In the area of non-discrimination?

C. If this dichotomy is irreconcilable, should other, less active strategies, be employed in the enforcement of existing legislation? Would this be more diplomatic and, therefore, more effective over the long run? Or should aggressive implementation be pursued?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the rights of the minority impinging on the rights of the majority. . .

. . . This question should be rephrased as follows: "To what extent does the assertion of the rights of the handicapped minority expand and clarify the rights of the majority?" Addressing the apparent dilemma in this manner would insure that the rights of the majority are extended to all – this would lead to increased, positive social acceptance of the handicapped person and their struggle for equality. . .

Concerning affirmative action legislation. . .

. . . The utilization or implementation of affirmative action legislation means that prejudices cannot interfere with the selection of a qualified applicant. If the handicapped person gets the job ahead of a nonhandicapped person, the reason must be because of qualifications not membership in a protected minority. . .

Concerning non-discrimination on the basis of handicap (Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973). . .

. . . Expenses incurred as a result of compliance with Section 504 are not unjust since they are the consequence of an exclusionary practice of our society. In other words, we must now pay for our discrimination against handicapped people. And pay we must, for our democratic form of government cannot tolerate anything except complete and aggressive implementation of non-discrimination legislation for handicapped people. . .

# Legislation

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of oversight hearings limit the assessment and revision of existing legislation, regulations, etc. | Attempt to insure that appropriate oversight hearings are regularly and effectively conducted. | Build oversight into the law or regulation. | Congress. |
| | | Suggest that the Administrative Procedures Act require public hearings on *all* proposed rule-making. | Congress. |
| | | Limit the calendar authorization. | Congress. |
| | | Encourage federal agencies to solicit regulatory input through hearings when not so mandated by Congress. | Federal agencies. |
| Time frame problems exist: too long for regulation development, implementation, and lack of speedy appeal process; and, for drafting, introducing and passing legislation. | Generate increased awareness for all concerned parties so that: 1.) the anticipated schedule for a specific activity is known, and 2.) procedures for adjusting the schedule are known. | Identify potential problems in implementing the law. | Congress, Executive Branch. |
| | | Professional and advocacy groups activate communication networks when needed to help speed up process. | Professional and advocacy groups. |
| | Criteria for determining compliance and for appeals and timelines for such appeals be clearly spelled out in all appropriate legislation. | Have appropriate advocacy groups communicate with Congress regarding appeals procedures, criteria and timeline. | Advocacy group Congress. |
| Lack of organization of vested interest groups (e.g. employer/employee organizations, unions, sheltered workshops, professional organizations, etc). | Make goals or objectives more important than professional jealousy, competitive programming, etc. | Better communications among related agencies. Also, cooperative efforts that strengthen the whole system not promote one special interest group. | Interest groups involved in the training, education and placement of handicapped people. |
| Lack of appropriate legislation supporting the goal of employment for handicapped people. | Provide a base subsidy or wage subsidy for low producing handicapped workers. | Legislative amendments. | Congress. |
| | Extend Social Security health and insurance benefits for a period of time beyond initial employment. | | |

# Parents and Voluntary Health Agencies

**Issue Statement:**
New legislation guarantees the right of handicapped people to receive equal treatment in the areas of education, training and placement. The enormous impact potential that this has for regular education, vocational education, industrial arts, vocational rehabilitation and job placement agencies makes it very unlikely that government alone can effectively implement this legislation.

Groups of, and for handicapped people are being encouraged by government to assist in the promulgation of these new programs. While their cooperation will assist greatly, there remains a need to further extend awareness and advocacy of these laws to every handicapped individual as well as every parent or guardian of a handicapped child or youth. However, this is a very complex task. Apart from the communications difficulty inherent in such an endeavor, the most difficult problem to deal with is the reluctance of many parents to be aggressive concerning the rights and needs of their handicapped children for job preparation and placement services.

Some of these parents tend to become preoccupied with the enormous odds that their child will face in life. Society's attitude towards the disabled tells them that their child is different, not normal. In this emotional environment parents are more likely to resign themselves to the pronouncements of local education agencies and specialists that inform them that they can do little or nothing for their child. All this disappointment may lead to a low set of expectations for the development of their handicapped child. The net result is a docility or even an unwillingness to fight against the opinions of professionals.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. What role can parents play in the drive to improve job preparation and placement services for handicapped people? What role can groups of, by and for the handicapped play?

B. How can parents be better utilized to act effectively for the rights of handicapped people?

C. How can we deal with the low expectations many parents can fall prey to, which may inhibit the development of their handicapped child?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the potentials parents possess. . .
. . . In order to act effectively for the rights of the handicapped child, parents need to work as a group, lobbying legislators, school boards and businesses. . .

Concerning the "low expectation syndrome". . .
. . . In order to counteract the "low expectation syndrome," parents need to be exposed to large doses of success stories and examples of the variety of possibilities that exist for handicapped people. By involvement in the special education, industrial arts, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation process, parents can be made aware that there *is* help available.

# Parents and Voluntary Agencies

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| The educational experience does not provide for development of self-concept, adaptive behavior and social adjustment for handicapped students. | Curriculum should include components that develop these attributes. This would include recreation, positive role models, socialization. | Teacher trainees should emphasize total person needs, not just academic. | Universities, state and local boards of education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |
| The educational experience lacks pre-vocational and job-related instruction for handicapped child. | Integrate handicapped child into career education programs at all levels (K-12). Provide career awareness and hands-on experiences. | Get special education and vocational education and vocational rehabilitation working together. | Special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation. |
| Communications barriers among handicapped people - parents - professionals and agency people. | Be willing to listen to each other share ideas with each other; respect each other's views and learn to work together. | Avoid ego trips and attempt to give best service to individual. | Everyone involved. |
| Lack of interdisciplinary mechanism for meeting service needs of people. | Form interdisciplinary coalitions at the local level. | Set agency funds aside for such purposes. Appoint staff. | Education personnel, vocational education, industrial arts, unions, parents, employment security, teacher trainers, etc. |
| Society still holds a stereotyped idea of handicapped people, which holds them back. | Coordinated public relations efforts. | Via media, conferences and other means. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, National Voluntary Health Agencies. |
| The misconceptions and stereotyping of handicapped people by the general public begins during early years. | Early education of youths concerning the realities and potentials of handicapped people. | Instruction, role playing, interaction with handicapped people, inclusion of handicapped people in children's books, etc. | Media centers, teachers, Public Broadcasting Systems and other creators of childrens entertainment, book publishers. |
| Lack of input by parents of handicapped youth in state, local and federal advisory bodies. | Require parent as well as consumer representation on all advisory bodies. | Enlist the cooperation of parent groups. | All government agencies. |
| Lack of central information or referral systems for parents to go to for guidance and assistance. | Adapt a system such as MEDLAR to service programs for handicapped people. | All agencies providing services should pool resources for an information system. | All service agencies. |

# Materials

**Issue Statement:**

Many vocational educators, industrial arts teachers and regular education teachers cite both the inadequacy and meagerness of existing materials on "how to" teach handicapped people in their respective curriculum as a barrier to serving them in their programs. They remind us that very little information exists that deals with the techniques of teaching either academic or vocational skills to the deaf, blind, retarded, etc. in a regular classroom setting. Since they don't have the information or materials necessary to realistically and successfully teach handicapped students, then they can't be expected to admit them into their programs. However, handicapped people aren't so unique that all principles of education and training need to be reworked into "special" courses needing special materials. After all, handicapped people are people too and teachers teach people.

Also, the development of these special materials may be a long way off. Presently, no effective nationwide system of dissemination of successful practices and procedures in this area exists. Research in these fields seems to be a low priority item. If handicapped people must wait until materials are forthcoming, they will loose innumerable opportunities for education and training. Handicapped students should be admitted now to vocational education, industrial arts and regular education. Good teachers can teach and are resourceful enough to successfully work with handicapped students.

**Some Questions to Consider:**

A. How essential are "special" materials in vocational education? In industrial arts? In regular education? To what extent must service hinge upon their availability?

B. Could vocational, and industrial arts teachers teach handicapped students without a great deal of difficulty and without special materials? What disabilities would be successful? Which ones not successful?

C. Why is there a lack of materials in these areas?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the necessity of special materials to teach handicapped students. . .

. . . A prerequisite to effective and efficient utilization of materials as "tools" for the delivery of educational services is an increase in teachers' awareness and assessment towards their own potential as educators of handicapped individuals. Implicit in this awareness is the expected result that they will begin to think that they are teaching people who just happen to have handicaps. Hopefully, teachers will have an opportunity to improve their own level of confidence in this regard, and will begin to comprehend materials as "tools" rather than skills. . .

Concerning the ability of vocational education and industrial arts teachers to teach handicapped students. . .

. . . Throughout their history vocational and industrial arts educators have worked with students with exceptionalities. Recently, however, the added "crunch" caused by decreasing budgets and increasing class size has forced these educators to deny handicapped students access to their classrooms. It is incumbent upon special education, and vocational rehabilitation to support programs and facilities for the handicapped by providing academic and financial assistance. This could be best accomplished through interagency cooperation and cooperative agreements.

# Materials

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of research in materials development. | Facilitate, on an interagency basis, the necessary funding (both new and redirection of current fundings) to insure qualified research and development that will meet the specialized needs of handicapped students in industrial arts, prevocational education, vocational education, special education, secondary materials and vocational rehabilitation materials in support of school age children. | Provide funding through existing and new programs. | Enforcement agency for PL 94-482 (the new Vocational Education Act).<br>State advisory councils on vocational education.<br>Consumer groups.<br>American Vocational Association (AVA), National Rehabilitation Association (NRA), National Education Association (NEA) and other professional associations. |
| Lack of a scheme designed to insure utilization of new materials. | Develop a materials delivery system to insure appropriate dissemination and utilization of newly developed materials. This system must include an evaluation component and involve related disciplines. | Existing national materials centers should be made to work for the people who need the materials. They must be accessible to the teacher. Expand regional resource centers to include secondary materials dissemination.<br>Agencies that fund resource with public monies must disseminate information to the public. | National Center for Educational Media and Materials at Ohio State University. Regional Resource Center Systems.<br>Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education's Rehabilitation Services Administration and Department of Labor. |
| Lack of a long-range and organized scheme for materials development. | Organize a strategy that would insure the development of effective materials and resources related to both handicapped students' needs and the preparation of educational personnel; use these resources and materials. | This strategy must:<br>1.) Allow input from the field.<br>2.) Insure inter-discipline involvement.<br>3.) Insure dissemination and evaluation.<br>4.) Insure that the development of materials is accountable for process and products.<br>5.) Insure a locus - either center, centers or consortium of programs for the development of programs. | Regulation writers must provide for these "safe guards" in funding research.<br>Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Rehabilitation Services Administration and Vocational Education. |
| Administrator's attitudes against programming and curriculum development for handicapped students. | Develop a strategy for overcoming attitudinal problems related to:<br>1.) the "not developed here" syndrome;<br>2.) administrative apathy;<br>3.) teacher lack of involvement or teacher fear;<br>4.) over emphasis on the need for special materials. | Dissemination and utilization workshops should be included in all grants involving materials development.<br>Field testing and field involvement should be a part of all materials development<br>Include both administrative staff and teachers in the planning and development of materials.<br>Include a course or coursework dealing with curriculum development in all teacher preparation programs.<br>Increase teachers' awareness concerning their own capability and resourcefulness in adapting and utilizing materials. | Granting agencies.<br>Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. All other education agencies. |
| Lack of career education materials for handicapped individuals. | Develop realistic career education materials for students with disabilities that show career options for the types of disabilities that exist. | Obtain input from employers, handicapped people, parents and teachers. | U.S. Office of Education's Office of Career Education. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of "role model" material for handicapped students. | Develop "role model" information for both career awareness and career encouragement of students and parents as well. | Document a variety of success stories of handicapped workers. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Vocational Education, U.S. Department of Labor. |
| Lack of consideration of the needs of handicapped in regular career education, vocational education, industrial arts, regular ed. | In view of section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973, all materials should include the needs of handicapped people in order not to discriminate against them. | Include handicapped in all definitions used by career education, vocational education, industrial arts and regular education. | Congress, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Office of Education. |
| Lack of materials for employers, trainers and counselors on "how to" re-design jobs to make them accessible to handicapped people. | Develop materials that will guide employees in "how to" re-design jobs so that they are accessible to handicapped workers. | On-going task analysis of jobs must be conducted. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Department of Labor, Vocational Education. |
| Lack of job training based on task analysis and manpower needs. | Educators and trainers should be more realistic and current with curriculum and base it on existing employment market needs. | Utilize task analysis and manpower needs of industry. | Trainers and teachers. |
| Lack of a central or current registry of qualified handicapped individuals. | Establish a central or current registry and make available to both handicapped people and employers. | Pool resources and staff in a cooperative venture to maintain a central registry. | Employment Security, Vocational Rehabilitation, Vocational Education. |
| Lack of support of Regional Resource Center System for state secondary and post-secondary education and training programs for handicapped students. | Assign staff and set up a unit at each Regional Resource Center that advocates for and provides technical assistance to states in the area of prevocational, vocational education, industrial arts training and work-study programs for handicapped students. | Write modifications into organizational structure | U.S. Office of Education and Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |

# Interagency Cooperation

**Issue Statement:**

Those who provide education, vocational education, industrial arts, counseling, training and placement services have developed individual identities as both disciplines and agencies. The education agencies (with divisions of industrial arts, vocational education and special education), vocational rehabilitation, and employment security all have distinctive roles to play in the job preparation and placement of the individual.

This system of compartmentalized agencies enables clearly definable organizational units to concentrate on one phase of specialty. This is understandable from both a managerial and professional development stand point.

Yet, in the area of job preparation and placement of handicapped people these divisions of labor cause special difficulties for the disabled individual as he or she attempts to navigate through the entire system. A handicapped person, on his way to a job and a place in the community, will usually have to become involved with several separate agencies for his job preparation and placement. Since, in most instances, these agencies only pay attention to a certain dimension of this person's development – the benefit of the person being served may be weak or nonexistant.

This deficency in our job preparation and placement system becomes clear when we follow a path a handicapped child has to travel. First, there's special education. Next, if the handicapped child is fortunate, vocational education or industrial arts or vocational rehabilitation. And, lastly, employment security for job placement.

Rarely, during this process does one agency reinforce or support the efforts of another. Since we have separate agencies, the handicapped person can expect to encounter separate evaluation procedures, separate skills development techniques, separate counseling and a separate set of expectations as he moves from one agency to the next. Special education looks at the handicapped child from K-12. Vocational rehabilitation may "take over" at age 16. Special education and vocational rehabilitation rarely reinforce one another. If vocational education or industrial arts are to accept the handicapped child then vocational rehabilitation and special education will, in all probability, step aside. No steady support or continuity is available to the handicapped person who must negotiate many services; each with its independent mission.

Another difficulty created by this specialization of agencies results from the agency's need for identity and justification. Individual agency's self-concept is strong and tends to encourage a concentration of efforts and resources within those areas which will clearly demonstrate their competency. This attitude discourages any thoughts about sharing both responsibilities and resources with other agencies even when it would appear to be appropriate for the handicapped individual. For example, a handicapped child who is admitted into a vocational education class, may desperately need support (financial) from vocational rehabilitation for devices or aids that will help him to succeed. Or, that handicapped child may require program support (pre-vocational skills) from special education during the time he is with vocational education. Alone or independently, vocational education may be incapable of successfully serving the student. It may take the support of all three agencies. Yet, there remains a reluctance for individual agencies to cooperate among themselves for fear they may lose their integrity or credit for the resources they expend.

**Some Questions to Consider:**

A. To what extent do these agencies need to be independent of one another? To what extent do they need to be dependent?

B. What motivations exist that discourage interagency cooperation? How could they be resolved to permit closer cooperation?

C. Should a new organizational structure be considered for job preparation and placement services that would better serve handicapped people?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning interagency cooperation. . .

. . . The basic problem leading to effective interagency cooperation is to first identify where and how to place responsibility for that cooperation and coordination. Coordination will permit both dependent and independent action and leadership. There must be a design for delivery of that coordinated effort with the agencies involved in both planning and implementation. A multi-disciplinary team approach must be adopted and utilized. Expertise and resources of all agencies must be directed towards the achievement of these goals. The goals must be based on individual needs. This approach can very possibly emulate the IEP, Individualized Education Plan concept being implemented as a result of the Education for All the Handicapped Children Act. It would not be unlike the case-study approach. . .

. . . There is a need for the leadership of the President and Congress to focus on the needs of handicapped people; then devise a system of service delivery agencies that can meet those needs. Co-equal agencies will not get together unless "the Boss" demands that they do. . .

. . . Interagency cooperation must start at the federal level. State and local governmental agency cooperation will follow that model. Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education, United States Education Services, must come together and set the example. . .

. . . The lack of a strong commitment by individuals or by the government has helped to cause agencies to be mutually exclusive and operate independently. . .

. . . Agencies and disciplines need to be independent of one another only to the extent of developing expertise and establishing managerial operations. . .

# Interagency Cooperation

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of coordinating policy. | Task Force approach to interagency cooperation with clear identification of each agency's responsibilities. | Devise a system of rewards and sanctions for effective interagency cooperation. | Local agencies. |
| Existing legislation does not encourage cooperation. | Allied services legislation should be passed that provides for the pooling of resources and rewards agencies for interagency cooperation. | Executive and legislative branches, including monitoring functions, should re-evaluate the present system and incorporate one that allows and promotes cooperation. | Federal, state and local government, Congress. |
| Restrictive funding mechanisms that encourage competition among related agencies. | Funding should not be a matter of competition among related agencies for available resources. | In times of fiscal restraint coordination should be viewed as the most desirable way to cut funding. One related agency's needs should not be made to compete against another's for the human service dollar. | Federal, state and local government, Congress. |
| Lack of formal communications channels among related agencies. | Execute an audit of existing communications and develop an effective system based on the discrepancies uncovered. | Hire communications experts to aid in the audit and the development of the system. | Federal, state and local agencies. |
| Lack of a common terminology between related disciplines making communications difficult. | Develop a standard terminology for related disciplines to facilitate communications and interagency cooperation. | Related disciplines develop a glossary of terms to share with each other to provide, at least, an understanding of each other's terminology. | University teacher trainers, administrators, professional societies. |
| Lack of universal program guides. | We need program guides developed for each agency involved with handicapped people containing objectives, resources, etc. These should be shared among agencies and consumers and parents. | Each agency sponsoring a program should be mandated to publish and distribute such a guide. | All agencies. |
| Lack of training on how to best effectuate interagency cooperation. | Provide training in this management technique (both inservice and preservice). | Develop interagency cooperation as a management science or tool. | Universities, federal, state and local agencies. |
| Bureaucratic systems tend to become unresponsive to human needs. | Bureaucracies be forced to make periodic assessments of their weaknesses in meeting human needs and the consequences of their lack of cooperation with related agencies. | Develop guidelines for evaluation.<br>Rotate administrators with front line providers of services —"meet the people" and "meet the responsibilities".<br>Interagency evaluating committee — consumers, parents, service providers, employers and union people. | All human service delivery agencies at federal, state and local levels. |
| Evaluation systems that encourage completion due to an over reliance on quantity versus quality (management by objective syndrome). | Modification of evaluation systems to provide agency accountability based on successful case closure which includes referral and cooperation with a related agency. More weight or credit for the more severly handicapped and school age special education students. Case closure should be accurately defined so that differences can be made between under-employment or short term employment, etc. | Legislators change value system and fund agencies based on needs and successes serving *people*—not playing a numbers game. | Congress and state legislatures. Individual agency heads. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal policies that fund on the basis of last year's expenditures of individual agency. | Determine needs and use needs of people as the basis for next year's funding. Give credit for comingled funds that went to help people. | Computer reporting systems. Surveys through research. Consultations with professionals, and handicapped people. | Legislatures and General Accounting Office. |
| Too many interest groups and committees focusing on and advocating for one disability group only. | Establish interagency advisory committees with a global orientation to handicapped individuals. Use specialist with knowledge of specific disabilities on an "as needed" basis. | Avoid pressure from the most organized group representing a single disability. | Federal, state and local governments. |
| Fear of losing trained personnel to related agencies through interagency contact. | Establish comparable salary levels for personnel in related disciplines/agencies. | De-emphasize irrelevant certification requirements and place more emphasis on education and training needed to carry out the specific mandates of the job. | Federal, state and local civil service systems, professional societies. |
| Lack of full time, paid staff trained and experienced in providing programs for handicapped students in vocational, prevocational industrial arts, and career education at the secondary and post-secondary levels at federal agencies with responsibility for these services. | National level agencies hire qualified staff to act as advocates for programming for handicapped students in prevocational and job education. Presently, no such positions exist at Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Rehabilitation Services Administration and Office of Career Education. | Hire trained and experienced staff whose purpose is to advocate for programs that serve handicapped children. | Bureau of Adult and Occupational Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education of the Handicapped Office of Career Education. |
| Lack of full time, paid staff at state education agency level trained and experienced in providing programs for handicapped students in vocational, prevocational, industrial arts, and career education for the secondary and post-secondary schools. | State education agencies must hire qualified staff to advocate programming for handicapped students in prevocational, vocational, industrial arts and career education. | Hire trained and experienced staff whose purpose is to advocate for programs that serve handicapped children. | State education agencies. |

# Employers

**Issue Statement:**
For some time, "hire-the-handicapped" campaigns have been in existance. Now, Affirmative Action is on the scene (Section 503, Rehabilitation Act of 1973). With the implementation of this new legislative program, employment of handicapped people has begun to move out of the realm of voluntary action into the sphere of legal obligation.

Employers' responsibilities, however, have remained constant. They must develop and sustain profitable operations. They need job applicants who are qualified. They must keep overhead costs down. Every action they take must contribute to these needs.

In some employers' opinions, the Affirmative Action program creates economic hardship. Heretofore, employment of handicapped people has been voluntary. Employers could, without fear of reprisal, be selective in the hiring of handicapped people. They were free to constantly balance their basic responsibilities (profit, low costs) with their capacity to employ qualified handicapped job applicants. They had total control and responsibility over their business operations. With Affirmative Action, however, this is changing.

In addition, this new Affirmative Action program is causing an increased demand for qualified handicapped workers. Employers, for the most part, are anxious to demonstrate their willingness to comply with this new legislation. As a result, more and more employers are contacting state divisions of vocational rehabilitation, state employment security offices, workshops, voluntary health agencies, governor's committees on employment of the handicapped and others, asking for referrals of handicapped workers who can function in the kinds of occupations they have to offer. This increased demand for handicapped workers is not always being met. As a consequence, employers are faced with the dilemma of, possibly, employing less than qualified handicapped applicants in order to clearly fulfill the requirements being placed upon them by Affirmative Action; or, firmly maintaining their business orientation and not altering their standards even though this posture may give them the appearance of not complying with the Affirmative Action program.

Both situations, the lessening of employer control over his work force because of Affirmative Action (but not his responsibility) and the less than adequate support by traditional job preparation and placement agencies are, in some people's opinion, helping to foster a negatve feeling about Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

On the other hand, however, handicapped people have not been afforded protection against discrimination that other minorities have long had in the area of employment. In the past, they can do very little to redress their grievances. As a result, it is commonly accepted that a genuine need exists for the implementation of this Affirmative Action program for handicapped people.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. What advantage does the voluntary compliance, which is inherent in the traditional "hire-the-handicapped" efforts, have over Affirmative Action? What is the role of this program in the face of Affirmative Action?

B. What are the advantages of Affirmative Action?

C. How do we balance employers' responsibilities for profits and low costs with Affirmative Action responsibility? Is it clearly economically sound to hire handicapped workers? Do employers lose control over their operations with Affirmative Action?

D. How should employers balance the fact that qualified handicapped workers are scarce, with their need to demonstrate "good faith" to Affirmative Action?

E. How do the needs of handicapped people for protection and fair consideration in employment balance with the employer's need to control his or her business? Whose rights should prevail? How can they both be accommodated?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the Affirmative Action program (Section 503, Rehabilitation Act of 1973). . .
. . . The Affirmative Action program is required only of those companies contracting with the federal government in the amount of $50,000 or more. The Affirmative Action plan requirements state that the company will make every effort to contact vocational rehabilitation and other groups to seek qualified handicapped employees. There are no quotas or timetables required, only good faith. Complaints may be processed against any company with a federal contract of $2,500 or more. . .

Concerning the relationship of the voluntary "hire the handicapped" campaigns with Section 503. . .
. . . The voluntary programs not only reach out to those employers who are not covered by Section 503; but they also offer ready-made support to those employers who must comply with the Affirmative Action requirements. Further, they foster goodwill through public relations efforts. . .

Concerning the responsibilities of employers toward their businesses. . .
. . . Affirmative Action only requires the hiring of *qualified* handicapped workers. Since an employer's responsibility is to hire qualified workers, this program should not be viewed as threatening to employers. It clearly respects their responsibilities. . .

Concerning the needs of handicapped people. . .
. . . The most important part of the Affirmative Action program is that it provides procedures for the handicapped to fight discrimination; it offers them a vehicle to combat unfair and discriminatory employment practices and allows the handicapped individual a legal, regulatory "official" channel to correct these injustices. . .

Concerning aggressive implementation of Affirmative Action for handicaped...
. . . The relative success of the current minority and female Affirmative Action programs was due to the severe penalities invoked for non-compliance. We do not believe that the Affirmative Action program for handicapped workers will be effective until similar penalties are included. A more aggressive posture must be pursued. . .

# Employers

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ineffective organization for training, education and placement for handicapped individuals at the federal, state and local levels. | Develop a comprehensive organizational structure to define, develop, implement and administer the employment services for the handicapped people. | Reorganization: At each level of government have one overall director responsible to an executive committee composed of each related profession. Division of this single department should be:<br>1.) Public affairs<br>2.) Education and training<br>3.) Financing<br>4.) Research and development<br>5.) Legislation<br>6.) Coordination<br>7.) Job bank (placement) | Legislatures. |
| Lack of employer involvement in the job preparation and placement of handicapped individuals. | Job preparation and placement agencies must be continually in contact with employers in order to know their needs and develop programs designed to meet these needs. | Continual liaison with employers to involve them in rehabilitation. | Rehabilitation Services Administration. State directors of rehabilitation, special education, vocational education, industrial arts. |

# Insurance

**Issue Statement:**
Fears that the hiring of handicapped people will increase insurance used to be unfounded. Insurance costs are based on company history not on the composition of the workforce. Handicapped workers, when properly placed, have demonstrated comparable insurance histories to those of nonhandicapped workers.

Under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the term "handicapped person" includes people with histories of cancer, heart disease, and other degenerative or progressively worsening conditions. Under this definition, employers' concern over increased insurance costs becomes much more real. A significant barrier to the employment of handicapped people appears to have been created.

However, this new definition is a part of an obligatory program for employers with federal contracts of $2500 or more. No longer can an employer in this category react in a voluntary way to an anticipated increase in insurance cost for the hiring of some categories of handicapped people. The employer can't refuse to hire anyone on that basis. Thus, the situation could develop where a company with an outstanding insurance package (especially employee benefits) might attract handicapped job applicants who have predictably short life expectances. Under Affirmative Action the employer has no choice, if the handicapped applicant is qualified, regardless of any long term prognosis. Indeed, the employer would seem to be caught in very difficult situation.

On the other hand, this Affirmative Action program is seen by most as a necessary and reasonable protection for handicapped people against discrimination in employment on the basis of disabling condition.

Further, many believe that handicapped people with histories of cancer, cardiac disease and other degenerate conditions should be permitted to benefit from all legal protection afforded to "more stable" disabled persons. After all, no one else is judged on their life expectancy when seeking employment.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. Should employers be required to hire those handicapped people with predictably short life expectancies if they are otherwise qualified for the job? What about the employer's obligation to the company to keep insurance costs down?

B. Should the employer be permitted to make adjustments to the company's insurance offerings to this category of employee?

C. Should government provide relief to employers in these instances? Would a quota system help?

D. Should insurance companies be expected to share in this responsibility in any way?

E. If modifications to the existing situation are suggested to aid the employer, how do they effect the right of this category of handicapped job applicant to be considered for employment solely on the basis of his or her ability to do the work?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the required hiring of "short life expectancy" workers. . .
. . . "Short life expectancy" needs definition. Employers have the right to expect reasonable life expectancy of new employees. If expectancy is a matter of a couple of months, the burden created by Affirmatie Action should not be borne solely by the employer. The government should absorb excessive insurance costs. In general, more experience is needed on how to deal with the dilemma. . .

Concerning the right of a handicapped person to be considered solely on the basis of his or her ability to do the job. . .
. . . While there is the right of the disabled person to obtain work, there is, in our society, the right and need to expect productive work from the individual. If these terms cannot be met, then society (legislation) must devise a system that is fair to both the disabled applicant and the employer.

# Insurance

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| A general lack of information concerning hiring handicapped people and insurance costs. | Sponsor a national conference to review and clarify rating policy of insurance companies. Separate facts from myths then devise programs to deal with factual problems. Finally, set-up a system of information on this subject. Also support research on this topic. | Bring insurance companies, employers, unions, rehab professionals, etc., together to develop issues.<br><br>Provide funding. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |
| Lack of investigation and monitoring of insurance company practices in the area of employment of handicapped people. | Investigate current industry practices. Promote model efforts. | Through appropriate investigatory agency. | Federal Trade Commission, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. |
| Lack of continuity between federal programs and private enterprise in this area. | Reform SSI and SSDI program so that it continues to provide medical benefits for newly working handicapped citizens. Establish 2nd Injury Fund Laws in all states. Consider a National Second Injury Fund Law. | Investigate process. | General Accounting Office Social Security Administration.<br><br>Congress |
| | Establish coordinated interagency task force to oversee the full range of insurance and other services provided to the handicapped. | Select representatives from different agencies, disability categories and geographic regions. | President. |
| | Modify Rehab. Act (affirmative action program) to allow waiver of fringe benefit insurance rights to terminally ill job applicants. | Investigate reality of this problem then devise a solution. | Congress and General Accounting Office. |

# Accessibility

**Issue Statement:**
Very little progress towards equal opportunities for the handicapped population is possible without the elimination of architectural barriers. Laws presently on the books in all fifty states and at the federal level prohibit construction of publically funded buildings and facilities that are inaccessible to physically handicapped people. However, many public buildings continue to be built without the architectural features which grant physically handicapped people access.

One of the reasons for this is a widely held belief that total environmental accessibility is an unrealistic goal for three reasons: 1) Barrier free design is expensive. 2) It might impede or interfere with other people's mobility. This is especially true in rapid transit systems where the introduction of a person in a wheelchair could slow down the whole system. 3) Total environmental accessibility is unnecessary. Why, for example, should we strive to make every public school in a district accessible when one or two would be adequate to serve the needs of the area's handicapped children?

Of these three arguments – of the greatest concern to the handicapped people is the last one. There seems to be a growing feeling that accessibility doesn't have to mean that every school building, or every classroom, or every rest room has to be made accessible to every physically handicapped person in order to satisfy the needs of handicapped people. This argument, discouraging enough for some in any form, becomes particularly painful when it is logically extended to decree that not every college or university has to be made accessible, only a select number. Or that not every vocational or industrial arts classroom needs to be made accessible. Just those where it is realistic to expect that a disabled person could actually benefit from the training. However, this limits a handicapped person's freedom of choice which is a right granted to every citizen.

**Some Questions to Consider:**

A. Are our state/federal architectural barriers laws adequate in form and implementation? How should they be improved? How do these laws effect job preparation and placement opportunities?

B. Is total accessibility an unrealistic goal?

C. Should we strive to make every school, every classroom, every vocational education, industrial arts classroom accessible to every handicapped person? If not, who should judge where and when to make a service or educational opportunity accessible?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the adequacy of state and federal architectural barrier laws. . .
. . . Some laws are more effective than others, particularly those state laws which provide for oversight and provide penalties for noncompliance. They could all be improved by developing and implementing model legislation that incorporates the best features of the many laws.

Concerning the goal of total environmental accessibility. . .
. . . We must strive to make every classroom in every school district accessible to handicapped students if the goals set forth in Public Law 94-142 (Education for All the Handicapped Children Act) and Section 504 (Rehab Act of 1973) exemplify the spirit of America. To do any less is tantamount to discriminating against a segment of the population; or to limit their choice as to where they can work, learn, play, etc.

# Accessibility

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of appropriate legislation, enforcement, uniform criteria for assuring accessible facilities and buildings. | Develop model legislation with proper enforcement, uniform criteria and sanctions. | Organize consumer groups and agree on single set of standards in order to avoid confusion. | Consumer groups. |
| | Have criteria adopted into state and local building codes to cover both public and privately owned but publically used buildings. | Have all model building codes include barrier free design principles. Then work in each community to get them adopted. | Local housing authority. |
| | | Amend PL 90-480. | Congress. |
| | Devise a system of tax credits for barrier removal. | Amend tax laws. | Congress. |
| Lack of demand by consumers; lack of commitment by public agencies; misconceptions of general public. | Handicapped consumers with top administrator backing, must organize, accept and fight for their rights to barrier free buildings. | Education, legislation, counseling and media. | Handicapped people, teachers, legislators, administrators, media and general public. |
| | General public has to be made to see the man or woman — not the disability. | | |
| Lack of information on the severity of the impact of architectural barriers. | Our professional education programs must contain technical information on barrier free design. | Require course work in the area of barrier free design for architects, engineers and designers. | Accreditation agencies. |
| Lack of accessible transportation for handicapped workers and students. | Pass legislation insuring accessible mass transit systems. Provide low or no interest loans to handicapped workers for autos with hand controls. | Pass appropriate legislation. | Congress. |
| | Pass legislation protecting handicapped driver from excessive auto insurance premiums. | | |

# Consumerism

**Issue Statement:**
In recent years handicapped people have made great strides in asserting themselves as a minority and demanding their rights. This movement has been labeled "consumerism." Prior to its arrival, handicapped people were viewed as objects of charity. As a group, they seemed willing to accept the academic and vocational roles that professionals told them they were best suited for.

Now, under the influences of "consumerism" they are striving to gain control over their own destinies. As a result, handicapped people are beginning to apply pressure on education, vocational education, industrial arts, vocational rehabilitation, sheltered workshops and employers to meet their expectations.

One negative aspect that some people are concerned about is that consumerism might serve to undermine the faith in and the acceptance of professionals' judgement as they attempt to serve handicapped people in the job preparation and placement field. These service providers are trained in job analysis, assessment, training and placement. They know the requirements of a job and the world of work. If consumerism encourages handicapped people to view the "system" as unresponsive and limiting because it does not always support their highest aspirations then the wisdom it has to offer might be lost. The final result may be unrealistic expectations and failure in the face of qualified counseling.

The other concern about the possibility of negative influences from consumerism centers around handicapped people's demand for open access to all programming. Handicapped people want the barriers to equal opportunities removed. They want to have the chance to succeed or fail in a program on the basis of their ability, not on their disability. As a result, many handicapped people believe that they should have access to regular education, industrial arts, vocational education and all other training and placement services. A potential problem arises when this drive for equality ignores the traditional pathways that may be better equipped to insure an appropriate education, training or placement experience. Special education and vocational rehabilitation employ techniques specifically designed to enhance the education or training experience of the handicapped person. Some people fear a blind thirst for equality, could cause handicapped people to ignore or overlook the services that could serve them best.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. Is consumerism a valuable movement for the handicapped individual? To the service provider? Why?

B. Are the fears concerning consumerism expressed by some people legitimate? If so, what steps ought handicapped people take to avoid negative forces? If not, what steps should professionals take to understand consumerism?

C. Should the drive and motivation caused by consumerism be allowed to develop unchecked? Is it always realistic? How does it balance against professional judgement in matters of job preparation and placement?

D. Is consumerism a real or imagined threat to special education and vocational rehabilitation?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the value of the consumer movement. . .
. . .Consumerism is a valuable movement to the handicapped person because it provides him with the opportunity to voice his or her needs and to participate and influence his or her future and destiny. It is valuable to service providers because it gives them feedback and evaluation of the services rendered. . .

. . .Consumerism can be a valuable movement for service providers only if they are willing to listen and to remain unthreatened by both legitimate and unreasonable demands; always keeping in mind the possible frustration of the consumer. . .

. . .The most positive affect that a consumer movement has on any system is the effect of *forcing accountability*. . .

. . .If consumerism is perceived as a threat to special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation, then there must be reasons to feel threatened. Faith in professional judgements can only be acquired by positive experiences. If consumers are not pleased with the services being provided then they should assert themselves and verbalize their displeasure. . .

. . .A lack of unity and cooperation among the handicapped undermines and weakens the overall consumerism movement. The blind lobby for only the blind, the deaf for the deaf, etc.

. . .While there is some merit to the fear that consumerism can be overdone, the general attitude of handicapped people is one of "reasonable accommodations." Unreasonable demands stem from the failure on the part of government and the private sector to meet reasonable needs. . .

. . .Acceptance of the militancy of a previously passive group is the best indication that rehabilitation movements are finally bearing fruit. If parents must learn to cut the umbilical cord, so must professionals. . .

. . .In order to avoid the possible "back lash" created by unreasonable demands, handicapped people should offer solutions as well as criticisms. They should emphasize facts rather than emotional demands. . .

# Consumerism

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Inadequate opportunities for dialogue among consumers, parents, professionals, and employers. | Provide routine, planned opportunities for dialogue among consumers, parents and employers. | Provide through regulation and/or legislation for consumer, parents and employer participation in all job preparation and placement agencies. Provide funds/staff to insure these "committees" are viable and their advice considered. | Congress and state legislatures, state and federal agency administrators.<br>President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. |
| Fragmentation of consumer movement caused by special interests. | Develop local level committees of consumers representing all disabilities to study and advocate for resolution of problems facing all handicapped. | Identify advocates with the capacity to think in global terms. Establish Office for Handicapped Individuals in every city out of whose office this committee would operate. | Governor's Committees on Employment of the Handicapped, local consumer groups, handicapped people. |
| Inadequate research (pure and applied) in the area of aids, devices, etc. that would lessen the impact of the disability in the life of the handicapped person (especially in the area of employment—human reengineering). | Provide funds for research, improve aids and devices for handicapped people. Set-up a national clearing house to coordinate research and distribute results. | Identify specific research needs and fund them. | Congress, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |
| Lack of federal, state and local level coordination of related public and private agencies and organizations. | Increase and facilitate coordination among job preparation agencies at federal, state and local level. | Develop interagency agreements at all three administrative levels.<br>Establish a program of in-service training concerning related agency's functions. | Mayors, governors, President.<br>Congress,<br>State legislatures. |

# Testing and Evaluation

**Issue Statement:**
Regrettably, there are a limited number of vocational education, industrial arts, and occupational training opportunities in our country. As a result, some methods must be devised to select those most likely to benefit from the available programs. No equitable system other than traditional testing and evaluation techniques seem to be appropriate.

Unfortunately, however, the majority of tests and evaluation procedures that are used to select "qualified" students for these programs are designed in such a manner as to constitute a nearly insurmountable barrier to handicapped applicants. Handicapped students who are nonreaders have no hope. Other handicapped students may have disabilities that appear to automatically disqualify them from employment in their chosen occupational field. Or their disability may elicit such concern over safety that it would appear unwise to consider them for training in a given area. For other handicapped applicants, their prevocational training have been so poor that failure in the vocational program would be predictable.

Under our existing value system of selecting "qualified" candidates it seems to be acceptable to deny admittance to handicapped students for all or some of these reasons. Test and evaluation procedures have been tailored to the needs of nonhandicapped individuals and do not allow for the various methods that handicapped students have developed to succeed. Furthermore, such tests and procedures don't measure the increased capacity for success that can be achieved through special education and vocational rehabilitation.

And, lastly, these tests and evaluations reflect society's traditional myths and misconceptions about what handicapped people can and cannot do. On this basis many of these tests and evaluations are discriminatory and ought to be recognized in such a way as to make reasonable accommodations for handicapped people.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. To what extent are present testing and evaluation procedures unfair to handicapped people?

B. Is there another way of selecting students for vocational education, industrial arts, and occupational training other than the traditional process? Is there a way that would give handicapped people a chance at these programs?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning appropriate vocational evaluation. . .
. . .Appropriate vocational evaluation depends upon the service to be provided to the student once the evaluation is complete. It is the opinion of this group that programs based on skills are the most appropriate method of providing vocational training for the handicapped. Therefore, evaluation techniques should be designed to assess the student's ability for entry into such a program.

Evaluation should be:
1.) ongoing
2.) diagnostic of both strengths and weaknesses
3.) developmental/remedial rather than a discriminatory "screen out" process
4.) relevant to work situation (i.e. work samples, job try outs, etc.)
5.) relate to adaptive behavior and success of handicapped individual.

Work evaluation should include an assessment of an individual's ability in the following areas *when relevant:*
1.) physical development (including psycho-motor functioning)
2.) social and emotional development
3.) functional academic level
4.) psycho-educational development
5.) work samples/job try outs
6.) interest screening

The proficiency level established for the skills necessary for specific jobs should be the criteria against which the student is evaluated and his functional level determined. . .

Concerning the purpose of vocational testing and evaluation. . .
. . .Vocational testing and evaluation should:
1.) better understand the present and potential vocational skills and interests of the student;
2.) provide the student with the opportunity for career self-awareness and career counseling;
3.) provide diagnostic and/or prescriptive information for involved agencies (special ed, voc. ed., voc. rehab., industrial arts, etc.);
4.) assist in monitoring the student's growth and development;
5.) facilitate the development of an effective training, placement and follow-up program; and,
6.) facilitate the evaluation of the effectiveness of education and training programs and services. . .

Concerning the use of vocational evaluation. . .
. . . Any given test may purport to measure predispositions for certain types of work. However, there is a danger in this assumption if not used in conjunction with other evaluative instruments. A vocational battery measures vocational aptitude, interests and abilities, while academic achievement tests do not necessarily do so. . .

. . . Testing is frequently misused which often excludes students from vocational programs. Counseling in conjunction with testing is a better way to select, guide and assist students in making decisions. . .

Concerning the administering of vocational evaluation. . .
. . . Testing and evaluation requires a multi-disciplinary approach. Members of the team should include: 1.) a psychologist and/or counselor; 2.) special education teacher; 3.) vocational education teacher; and, 4.) other related professionals (i.e. vocational rehab).

. . . Evaluation and observations should be integrated in a multi-disciplinary staffing. Parent and student input is vital.

. . . Observation should be made in the setting that is most realistic to the work environment. The continuum is:

on-the-job: least restrictive

simulated job experience (work samples)

diagnostic office: most restrictive

. . . Initial assessment should occur when the student is preparing for entry into the service delivery program. There should be a continuous evaluation against the proficiency levels previously defined to determine movement from one level to another. . .

# Testing and Evaluation

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of trained personnel to administer and evaluate vocational tests for handicapped students. | Expand preparation programs in work and vocational evaluation for service delivery personnel. | Establish work evaluation programs in higher education. Promote work evaluation specialists as professionals. Incorporate work evaluation skill training into traditional preservice curriculum. And, provide short term training for inservice personnel. | Institutions of higher education, training agencies administering rehabilitation, vocational evaluation (JEVS, singer, etc.). |
| Inadequate evaluation devices. | Review, adapt and expand existing evaluation devices. Identify the need for and develop new instruments. Insure that tests used for evaluation of handicapped have adaptations that yield true data. | Conduct a study to:<br>a.) Review existing devices and the information they provide.<br>b.) Identify informational needs.<br>c.) Balance a & b. | Qualified universities, commercial test publishers.<br><br>local education agency. |
| Need for the development of a systems/communication approach. | Encourage the development and use of a systematic approach to identify, evaluate clients, interpret and communicate results, update IEP and follow up. | Preservice, inservice training.<br>Properly developed materials.<br>Oversight by multi-disciplined advisory groups, and, through legislative mandate. | Universities, state agencies employers, local education agency. |
| Lack of coordination, cooperation and reinforcement of vocational training agencies and placement services. | Establish a program to train personnel to be knowledgeable in both vocational training and job placement. | Through certification requirements. And administrative mandates. | Training and placement personnel, training programs. |
| Lack of follow-up on vocational assessment/training programs. | Require and utilize follow-through and follow-up procedures for clients in the program or in new employment situations. | Re-evaluation criteria must be developed and required in state plans. | All agencies providing vocational training. |
| Lack of prevocational experience of handicapped students makes them further handicapped when subjected to vocational tests and evaluations. | Include handicapped students in industrial arts training, prevocational training and career education. | Open-up existing opportunities to handicapped students. | Department of Health, Education and Welfare, state education agency, local education agency. |
| Over reliance on expensive commercial work-sample batteries. | Develop or identify cost-effective and content-effective processes that are accessible to local education agencies. | Fund research to determine most reliable and cost-effective instruments. Include a dissemination component. | Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Bureau of Occupation and Adult Education. |
| Existing vocational education selection processes does not give handicapped people an equal chance at voc. ed. | Guidelines need to be devised, promoted and enforced that provide for the needs of handicapped students in voc. ed., evaluation and testing. | State and federal legislation must be enacted to mandate equality in voc. ed. for handicapped. | Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rehabilitation Services Administration Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. |
| Lack of clear-cut guidelines as to who gets services from vocational rehabilitation. The power of the local rehabilitation counselor to determine eligibility is absolute and subjective. | A standardized evaluation process is needed. | Criteria must be put into the DVR state plans that specify uniform screening procedures. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, state plan writers. |

# Attitudes

**Issue Statement:**
Many problems exist in extending job preparation and placement services to handicapped people. There is a shortage of financial resources, inadequate personnel preparation, programming dilemmas, inadequate evaluation and testing procedures, difficulties with legislative programs, a lack of interagency cooperation . . . to mention just a few.

Some advocates, while viewing this situation, might wonder if all these issues and barriers are really only symptoms of a disease rather than independent considerations which should be attacked, evaluated, and resolved, one at a time. Those who would react this way might do so out of sheer frustration or they may prove to be the most perceptive of us all. In any event, their conclusion as to what kind of action needs to be taken becomes very simplistic. Attack the root cause! And that is the attitude among administrators who believe that handicapped people don't belong in regular education, vocational education, industrial arts, . unions and employment security offices. This approach to the problem suggest that the administrator's attitude toward the handicapped is the key to the problem. They believe that, if the administrators of these programs really want to grant handicapped people access to their programs, then, and only then, will it happen—barriers not withstanding. In short, the barriers are contrived decoys designed to implement the true feelings or attitudes of some professionals.

Others, however, would suggest that this appraisal of the situation is only partially correct. There is no general plot or conspiracy to bar handicapped people from our nation's education, training and placement services. Rather, it is a complex situation which deserves meticulous and systematic investigation and action.

Attitudes are crucial and play a significant part in the problem. The public's attitudes are more difficult to deal with than the barriers in legislation, programming, financing, etc. Consequently, we must expand our energies to mold a society which depends on effective laws, regulations, personnel preparation programs, interagency cooperation, etc. A change in the attitude of the general public will follow.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. To what extent is the problem of attitudes central to all the issues confronting handicapped people in the areas of job preparation and placement?

B. To what degree should we attack it?

C. Would our energies be better spent addressing the other barriers and Issues?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the "attitudinal" barriers handicapped people face. . .
. . . Research shows that people have an "expectation of normalcy" when they are dealing with other people. They change their level of expectation after contact and experience with those who have disabilities, accepting a broader range of normalcy. . .

. . . The administrator's attitude is crucial to the problem handicapped individuals face in all areas of concern. However, our energies should be primarily directed at molding a society which contains laws and regulations that guarantee equality for handicapped people. In the process of implementing appropriate legislation for handicapped persons, attitudes will change. The reason for this is that laws and regulations both educate and increase administrators' level of awareness concerning handicapped people. .

. . . You can rarely change an attitude by talking about it. If you change the environment, often a change of attitude is a natural consequence. Therefore, we need to focus more on changing situations rather than on developing attitudinal therapy programs. . .

. . . Attitudes are an important component in the acceptance and participation of handicapped individuals in the mainstream of society. First, what is needed is that we define what attitudes individuals should hold regarding the handicapped. Before addressing this question, we should determine who should hold these attitudes. For this purpose three categories of individuals can be identified: 1.) handicapped persons, 2.) legislators, 3.) members of the general public. With regard to handicapped individuals, positive role models of success stories must be provided so that these individuals will realize that there is not only hope but a realistic chance of success. Secondly, proper training and education must be assured, as well as, an environment fully accessible to handicapped persons to maximize their functional autonomy. Resources should be developed to assure that handicapped persons will, 1.) develop a positive self-image, 2.) participate and demand recognition by non-handicapped members of society. . .

. . . Once the general populace realizes that handicapped persons have a positive self-image, in that they strive for achievement and militantly call for public recognition of their rights, public sentiment will be responsive. Their situation is analogous to the development of equal rights for blacks. To a large degree, such a change in attitude has already occurred for handicapped people, as evidenced by the passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. That Act indicates the public concern has been sufficiently strong that Congress was motivated to pass a statute assuring non-discrimination on the basis of handicap. . .

. . . Now that the Rehab Act is on the books, resources should be channeled toward the implementation of the rights guaranteed to handicapped individuals under the Act. Once members of the public are placed into contact with handicapped individuals in educational and employment contexts their attitudes toward the handicapped will become more positive. Of course, positive image reinforcement to handicapped individuals, particularly youths, should be given a top priority. . .

. . . We must move ahead in implementing the integration of handicapped people into our society, especially our schools. Only by providing non-segregated services, whenever possible, will the public get to know handicapped people. This process must begin at the earliest level in our educational system.

# Attitudes

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of awareness of preschool and primary school age children about handicapped persons. | Non-segregation of handicapped children into special classes. | Train teachers to teach both handicapped and non-handicapped students. If full integration is not feasible, integration of some class activities should be undertaken. | Department of Health, Education and Welfare, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, voluntary health agencies, consumer groups, state education agency, local education agency. |
| | Encourage textbooks depicting handicapped children. | Consumer lobby to encourage depiction of the handicapped with publishers and school boards. | |
| | Media (especially children's t.v. programs) should include handicapped children. | Contacting programers and FCC. | |
| | Educate parents to encourage and allow their children to play and associate with handicapped children in a normal fashion. | Work through PTA's and parent organizations. | |
| | Encourage non-discrimination on basis of handicap in youth organizations (i.e., scouts). | Encourage parents of handicapped children to assume positions of leadership in these organizations. Encourage university internships to form such groups. | |
| Existing myths and misconceptions concerning the dependency of handicapped people. The charity syndrome. | Include information regarding the development and capabilities of handicapped individuals in health classes in public schools. | Contact school boards, teachers and textbook publishers. | Department of Health, Education and Welfare, state education agency, local education agency. |
| | Non-segregation of the handicapped in all contexts. | Barrier-free environment. | |
| | State and community support of independent living arrangements and dissemination of information regarding its availability. | State funding must be made available to implement this recommendation. | |
| | Emphasize at both levels of professional and interpersonal contacts that each handicapped individual is "unique" and not just a uniform part of the handicapped class. | Stress similarities between the handicapped and the non-handicapped. | |
| Lack of awareness of the legal rights of the handicapped. | General dissemination of information to the handicapped and general public. | Use of the communication networks of the following organizations to disseminate information to their members: a.) handicapped consumer groups; b.) labor unions; c.) civil rights groups; d.) public interest lobbies; e.) job counselors; f.) DVR; g.) employer organizations and magazines; h.) educational associations; i.) media/public service announcements. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. voluntary health agencies, consumer groups. |
| | Make each Governor's Committee a clearing house of information regarding handicapped rights. | Funding legal services organizations to protect and enforce handicapped rights. | |
| | Advertise places where handicapped individuals can contact to learn about their rights. | | |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of positive image of the handicapped in the media, textbooks, films, TV, etc. | Persuade media people to include the handicapped. Encourage handicapped people to seek career in the media. | Lobbying techniques. Education of media officials. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. voluntary health agencies. |
| Lack of a broad range of career options by agencies involved in the job preparation and placement of handicapped people. Stereotyped career expectation for the handicapped. | Media depiction of successful handicapped individuals performing a variety of tasks.<br>Educate career and placement counselors, teachers, parents, regarding the capabilities of handicapped children.<br>Non-stereotyping by rehabilitation professionals—give individual attention.<br>Conduct survey of types of jobs handicapped individuals hold. | Lobbying efforts; feedback mechanisms to depicters of the handicapped, FCC contact.<br>Encourage such training at their level of initial training and during re-education courses.<br>Contact HEW or Department of Labor to conduct such a survey. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, state education agency, universities, local education agency. |

# Unions and Trade Associations

**Issue Statement:**
When handicapped people seek jobs in occupations covered by union and trade association rules and agreements, special problems may present themselves. The two most frequently encountered problems are those created by the senority system and apprenticeship requirements.

The first, the senority system, is a practice whereby the less strenuous jobs, which are sometimes viewed in a prestigious way, are saved for long-time union members who, through advancing age or disability, are unable to function in their present union positions. This practice is a cherished safeguard against loss of employment for an old or newly injured union worker. In many ways, it seems to be a reasonable system with a laudable objective.

Unfortunately, however, for a handicapped person with physical limitations, it effectively places out of reach those union jobs which they could best function in. The senority system, unwittingly, denies employment opportunities to handicapped people.

Union officials, understandably, don't want to give up this practice because of the obvious protection it provides its members. Nevertheless, some believe it is unfair to deny the handicapped access to these jobs solely on the basis of what might happen to other union workers.

The other practice which can inhibit employment of handicapped people in union or trade jobs is the system of apprenticeship requirements. In many occupations certain periods of time must be spent at lower steps or levels. In a number of these steps the physical demands required to perform the job may automatically disqualify some handicapped applicants from consideration for the occupation they are leading towards. But in many instances, these steps or levels may not be essential to learning the skills of the job. A possible solution to this problem might be to provide handicapped people with optional types of apprenticeship requirements, if they possess the capacity to function effectively in the job or skill area which is the object of the apprenticeship program.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. To what extent is the senority system a barrier to employment in union jobs for handicapped people? What could be done to remove this barrier?

B. Are apprenticeship requirements denying job opportunities to handicapped people? How can this problem be resolved?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning union apprenticeship requirements. . .
. . . Labor union apprenticeships remain very political. Labor laws must be implemented to insure inclusion of the handicapped in these job opportunities, just as is being done for minorities. . .

. . . The issue of handicapped persons being unable to advance through various apprenticeship programs seems contrived. It seems to say that people are made to do things during an apprenticeship training period that they won't be required to use when they become journeymen. If this happens it has to be in very few situations. . .

. . . Apprenticeship requirements are denying job opportunities to the handicapped. Some adaptation of those requirements are appropriate if the goal can be achieved—as apprenticeship is a process to that goal. . .

Concerning the senority system. . .
. . . The senority system has been found, by unions, to be the most equitable way for workers in a bargaining unit to have access to jobs through promotions and to be protected from lay offs when there is a lack of jobs. . .

. . . The problems presented by the senority system (older or newly disabled union members monopolizing the most suitable jobs for handicapped people) could be dealt with by management in other ways (modified work load with full pay, workmen's compensation or any other form of company benefits). This would give the handicapped an opportunity to take a union job. . .

# Unions and Trade Assoc.

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Unions may not understand the concept and the role of sheltered workshops. | Inform and involve union representatives in processes to promote the understanding of sheltered workshops. | Convene a joint meeting of labor and workshops representatives to prepare guidelines, manuals and informational materials on the role of unions and workshops.<br>Use union media techniques.<br>Person-to-person contact. | President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, workshop organizations, union representatives.<br>Department of Labor, AFL-CIO and other labor unions.<br>Sheltered workshop directors. local union officials. |
| Unions may feel threatened by the "Projects with Industry" concept. | Projects should be mutually agreed upon (at local level) by the agency and the management of the union. | Have on-site visits at service-delivery agency by all parties involved. | Agency representatives.<br>National unions. |
| National union policies on handicapped need to be more effectively implemented at a local level. | Devise a more effective implementation of national policy at local level. | National headquarters issue directives to local union officials giving time tables for implementation. | |
| Unions may feel mistrust of programs which place students in work experience situations particularly when they are not involved in the planning. | Unions should be involved in work experience programs at local level. | Invite union representatives to participate on advisory panel to program. | Work-study coordinators. |
| There may be a lack of understanding between labor and agencies which serve the employment needs of handicapped people. | Agencies and unions, through increased communication, should clarify their respective philosophies, ideas and functions. | Sharing of literature, on-site visits exchange of representatives, in general better communications. | Union and agencies serving handicapped people (possibly through Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Handicapped and local mayor's committees. |
| The union philosophy of minimum wage appears to be in conflict with lower training compensation levels. | Unions should be better informed by community agencies concerning the training components for preparing handicapped people (students) for work. | Informational techniques. | Community agencies serving handicapped people. |
| Unions' resistance to changing or developing job descriptions may hurt the bidding rights of handicapped workers. | Job descriptions need to be updated on an ongoing basis and made more general to accommodate jobs for handicapped. | Renegotiate discussions with unions; initiated by management. | management and labor. |

# Sheltered Workshops

**Issue Statement:**
Even though sheltered workshops have been on the scene for some time there remains some confusion over the precise role or purpose they play. There are apparently, two differing views or opinions to consider.

The first view concerning the purpose of sheltered workshops is that they are a valuable component to our country's vocatonal rehabilitation program. They exist for the purpose of providing handicapped people with rehabilitation, training and placement services. The goal envisioned for each workshop client is to develop their skills to the point where that person can be placed in a competitive employment situation. Sheltered workshops are transitional facilities.

Another view is that sheltered workshops are there to provide work for handicapped people who cannot be placed in competitive employment situations. In other words, they are the last resort employers.

**Some Questions to Consider:**
A. What value does each view have? Which purpose is the more desperately needed one?

B. What is the role of the sheltered workshop?

**Delegates' Comments**

Concerning the confusion over the role of the sheltered workshop. . .
. . . Neither role seems to be more important than the other. There is a need for extended (sheltered workshop) employment for severely disabled persons but there is a similar need for short-term employment and training for higher functioning disabled persons.

Each person (workshop client) should have an appropriate comprehensive program of evaluation, work adjustment and personal adjustment training. There should be a reevaluation of each disabled person in workshops to determine their progress and/or their readiness for competitive employment. The program should be designed to permit the handicapped person to develop their maximum level of productive functioning. The two roles described are not incompatible with each other. There should be provisions made for both types of programs.

# Sheltered Workshops

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lack of funding for extended services for the severely handicapped.<br>a.) full range of service funding lacks continuity.<br>b.) method of financing distracts program goals. | Establish strategies that allocate funds according to services being provided and level of function of client.<br>Allocate funding based on work flow with incentive for aggressive work development.<br>Develop financial support to underwrite cost of professional and technical services—counseling, training and industrial engineering. | Joint planning of extended employment support by funding agencies (see who) | Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, and State agencies serving handicapped. |
| Dept. of Labor regulations on work activity centers limit upward mobility of clients. | Dept. of Labor reevaluate its regulations on work activity centers to determine the effect of separating them into two categories. | U.S. Dept. of Labor through its Sheltered Workshop Advisory Committee. Contact work activity center directors through state and federal agencies. | Department of Labor. |
| Lack of professional training for workshops personnel. | Develop programs for training in the workshop field. | Revise present curriculum and add a certification procedure. | Professional associations, college-based training programs. |
| Lack of utilization of workshops by vocational education and special education as training sites. | Better enforcement of Voc. Ed 10% set-a-side program and amend legislation to use workshops as training sites. | Subcommittee oversight hearings; investigations. | Congress and General Accounting Office. |
| Lack of utilization of new practices and procedures in the workshop field. No dissemination of research. | Sheltered workshops should study and implement industry's sound management and operational techniques and disseminate research results. | Individual workshop directors, professional associations should monitor industry and research for results. | Workshop directors, and Rehabilitation Services Administration. |
| Confusion over terminology and functions of "rehabilitation facility" and "sheltered workshop." | Consider elimination of the term "sheltered." Greater stress should be given to rehabilitation services while recognizing that some workshops provide work exclusively without rehab. services. | Refer the terminology issue to professional organizations. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. |
| Lack of cooperation between state and private agencies in providing and purchasing services. | Link individualized program plan with agency contracts for services. | Mandate the development of contracts or agreements for services based on individualized plans for clients. | Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. |
| Lack of a standardized criteria of performance of workshops. | Develop a written plan that outlines the minimum requirements that a workshop should fulfill. | Mandate written performance criteria for workshops. | State agencies with jurisdiction. |
| Lack of interagency coordination of contracting activity. | Develop a written plan. | Mandate written plans or agreements for agencies with contracting potential so that workshops share in the work available on a more reliable basis. | State division of vocational rehabilitation, special education, state education agency. |
| Lack of linkage between workshops and industries. | Develop incentives for industries to cooperate with workshops. | Develop joint projects between industries and workshops, i.e. work stations in industries manned by workshops' clients; subcontracting of manufacturing with workshops.<br>Economic incentives could be:<br>– tax incentives<br>– credits for affirmative action requirements<br>– provide assistance in making work sites accessible (including job redesign) | Workshops, National Association of Manufacturers, National Trade Association, National Alliance of Businessmen, Rehabilitation Services Administration. |

| BARRIER | RECOMMENDATION | HOW | WHO |
|---|---|---|---|
| Public assistance, SSI and other social programs discourage work incentives | Federal agencies review regulations in these areas and modify those that discourage the client from leaving the protection of the program for work and independent living. | Agencies that fund these programs cooperate with goals to train, educate and place in employment handicapped clients. Establish a "National Forum" to pinpoint and review these problems. | Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Medical Services Administration, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Department of Agriculture, appropriate national organizations. |

List of Delegates to the National Forum on Pathways to Employment

Dr. Frank Bow, Director
American Coalition of Citizens with Disabilities
1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Richard Averbeck
6815 W. Capitol Drive
Milwaukee, WI 53216

Dr. Leonard Albright
284 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Henry Angle
10700 Page Avenue
Fairfax, VA 22030

Gerard P. Antonellis
182 Tremont Street
Department of Education
Boston, MA 02111

Mel Appell
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Frank Arbaugh
Supervisor
Industrial Arts and Occupational Program
Dover, DE 19901

Vaughn Ball
Bakery and Confectionery Workers Int' Union
1828 L Street
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Larry Baker
Assistant Professor
University of Missouri
8001 Natural Bridge Road
St. Louis, MO 63121

Dr. Don Barbaconi
American Association of School Administrators
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, VA 22205

Larry Barber
Vocational Education
Disadvantaged and Handicapped
P.O. Box 928
Lansing, MI 48904

Catherine Batsche, Director
Sauk Area Career Center
138th and Crawford
Robbins, IL 60472

Dr. Jan Baxter
Vocational Program for the Handicapped
State Department of Vocational Rehabilitation
Lansing, MI 48909

Dr. Bruce Beck, Counselor
601 East Main Street
Madison, WI 53703

Joyce Beam
Oxon Hill Sr. High School
6701 Leyte Drive
Oxon Hill, MD 20021

Dr. William Bean
Office for Handicapped Individuals
3511 South, HEW
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20201

Dr. Tom Bellamy
Center for Human Development
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Harold Benson
Project Director
TAPS
Epilepsy Foundation
Vocational Education Project
CETA
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Tamara Bibb
Division of Employment Security
Department of Commerce
210 Caldwell Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

John D. Bies
281 Education Building
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI 48202

Barbara Black
Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago
345 E. Superior
Chicago, IL 60611

Dr. Sandra Boland
Director of Career Education for the Handicapped
P.O. Box 578
La Salle, CO 80645

Roland Boldt
Administrator
Vocational Education
Field Operations
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 93814

Gay Bondurant
3121 Ponce de Leon Boulevard
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Dr. Wayne Booten
COOR
Calhoun Area Vocational Center
475 East Roosevelt
Battle Creek, MI 49017

Dr. Ruth Brown
Maryland State Department of Education
Staff Specialist - Programs for the Handicapped
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
P.O. Box 8717
BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

Marcie Brost
Wisconsin Association for Retarded Citizens
2700 Laura Lane
Middleton, WI 53562

Ted Brosnan
3987 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

James R. Burress
Committee for the Handicapped
1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. John Boyle
Director of Special Education
P.G. County Schools
Hyattsville, MD 20781

Dr. Perry Botwin
Department Chairman
Department of Special Education
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20006

Mary Lou Brewster
Director for Special Education
1210 13th Street
Parkersburg, WV 26105

Dr. Robert Brock
Director of Special Education Program
University of Wisconsin - Stout
Menomonie, WI 57451

Dr. Don E. Brolin
6 Hill Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Paul Cook
American Institute for Research
BOTAP
179 Arastraderor Road
Palo Alto, CA 94302

Robert S. Conklin
NAPH
12614 Flack Street
Wheaton, MD 20906

Dr. Charlotte Conaway
President - NAVESEP
Maryland State Department of Education
BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

John Collins
Rehab Group, Inc.
3110 Columbia Pike
Arlington, VA 22204

Dr. Donald Clark
Center for Career Development
College of Education
Texas A & M
College Station, TX 77843

Ray Cheever, Editor
Accent on Living Magazine
P.O. Box 726
Bloomington, IL 61701

Dr. Iva Dean Cook
West Virginia College of Graduate Studies
Department of Special Education
Institute, WV 25112

Dr. Pat Cegelka
University of Kentucky
220 Taylor Education Building
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. James Catania
Assistant Director
Waukesha Technical Institute
800 Main Street
Pewaukee, WI 53402

Tim Craig
National Association for Concerned Veterans
1900 L Street, NW
Room 314
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Richard Carlson
U.S. Office of Education
7th and D Streets, SW
Room 5130
Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Edwin Crawford
Director Career Education
3940 Elm Street
Upper Marlboro, MD 41145

Dr. Gary Clark
Associate Professor - Special Education
864 Haworth Hall
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045

Henry Colella
Assistant Superintendant
Division of Special Education
NASSAU Board of Education
Nassau, NY 12133

Grace Cheever, Editor
Accent on Living Magazine
P.O. Box 726
Bloomington, IL 61701

James Crowder
Assist. to the Vice President
Industrial Relations
The Garrett Corporation
9851 Sepulveda Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90009

Frank J. Cummings
Roger Williams General Hospital and Brown University
825 Chalkstone Avenue
Providence, RI 02908

Dr. Donald Clark
Center for Career Development
College of Education
Texas A & M
College Station, TX 77843

L. C. Dunlap
Senior EEO Consultant
Employee Relations Department
E. I. Du Pont
Wilmington, DE 19898

Silas Dann
Chief, Benefits Director
Veterans Administration
2033 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Hope Daugherty
Extension Service
4-H USDA
14th and Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20250

Cheryl Davis
80 West Dedham Street
Apartment 1212
Boston, MA 02118

Sy Dubow, Director
National Center for the Deaf
Gallaudet College
7th and Florida Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Sharon Davis
Council for Exceptional Children
Vocational Education Project
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Nancy Devier
American Home Economics Association
2010 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James J. Decker
Prince Georges County Public Schools
Upper Marlboro, MD 20870

Dr. William Dennis
Industrial Arts Program Office
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Washington, DC 20202

Robert Dockerdorf
Executive Director
C.C.A.
1111 E. Cold Springs
Baltimore, MD 21239

Evelyn Dolan, Ex. Secy.
Governor's Committee on EH
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Labor and Industry Building
Room 1005
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dr. Edward Doyle
Northern Area Administration Office
49h and Greenbelt Road
College Park, MD 20740

Robert Draney
Deputy Director
Division of Rehabilitation
S.E.A.
233 South 10th Street
Lincoln, NB 68508

William Eddy
Mid-East Regional Resource Center
Suite 505
1901 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Vance Engleman
Director of Training
Southwest Regional Resource Center
2363 Foothill Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84109

Tony Fiana
Voc. Prog. for the Handicapped
Department of Spec. Education
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Susan Fine
Northern Virginia Training Center
2038 Royal Fern Court
Reston, VA 22091

Tom Frank
1616 18th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Norman Fontes
Department of Communication
South Kedzie Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

Bernard Finger
U.S. Department of Labor
Room 3704
1515 Broadway
New York, NY 10036

Stephan Gambaro
Bureau of Rehabilitation Services
122 C Street, NW Rm 816
Washington, DC 20001

James J. Garibaldi
American Occupational Therapy Association
Executive Director
6000 Executive Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20852

Rich Garmon
Disabled Veterans of America
1221 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dr. Dean Garwood
Division of Vocational Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08625

James Gentry
8900 Townson Lane
Clinton, MD 20735

Dr. Frank Gentile
Vice President
Human Resources Center
Albertson, NY 11507

Judy Geoghegan
Missouri Division of Empl. Sec.
P.O. Box 59
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Oscar Gjernis
U.S. Employment Service
Patrick Henry Building
Room 8118
Washington, DC 20210

Leroy Goodman
U.S. Office of Education
BEH
Room 2604, ROB 3
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Peter Grassadonia
Office of Manpower Services
81 River Street
Montpelier, VT 05602

Linda Grubaugh
Tri-County Diversified Industries
2222 Spikes Street
Lansing, MI 48906

Robert Grubbs
Governor's Committee on EH
4407 MacCorkle Ave. SE
Charleston, WV 25304

Dr. Marc Hull
Center for Career Development
College of Education
Texas A & M
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Jean Hebeler
Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20740

Melvin Herman
153 Lakeview Avenue
Leonia, NY 07605

Mae Hightower
Executive Director
Curative Workshop
1600 Washington Street
Wilmington, DE 19802

Dr. C. L. Hiltbrunner
Box 3374
University Station
Laramie, WY 82071

Pat Hoessli
220 Taylor Education Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Lowell Harris
Coordinator for the Mentally Handicapped
Division of Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Construction
Raleigh, NC 27611

Dr. William Halloran
U.S. Office of Education
BEH
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Charles Harles
Goodwill Industries
9200 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20014

Dr. Nancy Harltey
Department of Industrial Education
Keene State College
Keene, NH 03431

Dr. Ed Harris
National Association of the Physically Handicapped
Route 1, Box 920
Milbrook, AL 36054

William Hays
Center for Rehabilitation and Manpower Services
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20740

Dr. Chiyo Horinuchi
Planning and Evaluation
State Education Agency
Denver, CO 80202

Soila Houser
AFT
Department of Legislation
11 DuPont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Brenda Jamison
Mainstream Inc.
1200 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Robert Jernigan
Vocational Rehabilitation
Cooperative School Program
Program Analyst
1309 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dr. David Jesser
Director of Career and Vocational Education
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Mary Johnson
Madison Opportunity Center
601 East Main Street
Madison, WI 53703

Dr. William Johnston
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Michael S. Jones
409 Farragut Street, NW
Washington, DC 20011

Stanley Jones, Ex. Secy.
Governor's Committee on EH
32 Winthrop Street
Augusta, ME 04330

Fred Juarbe
Veterans of Foreign Wars
200 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Debbie Kaplan
Center for Studies in Research Law
1124 DuPont Building
Washington, DC 20036

Raymond L. Kahn
National Easter Seal Society
2023 West Ogden
Chicago, IL 60612

Stan Kousnetz
National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Robert Taft Labs.
Columbia Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45226

Raymon Karhu
Cooper High School
8230 47th Avenue, N.
Minneapolis, MN 55428

Dr. J. Russell Kruppa
Trenton State College
25 Delaware Ave.
Trenton, NJ 08628

Dr. Charles Kokaska
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
California State University
Long Beach, CA 90840

Sherian Knight
Georgetown Law Center
Georgetown University
600 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Bonnie Kern
Special Services Offices
ESD 109
20000 Cypres Way
Alderwood Manor, WA 98036

Dr. Allen Kerns
University of South Florida
FAO 226
School of Education
Tampa, FL 33620

Austin Kerby
Director, National Economic Commission
American Legion
1608 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Ray Kemphf
Minnesota State Council for the Handicapped
3450 Birch Lane
Wayzata, MN 55391

David Katzin
Governor's Committee on EH
Department of Labor Building
200 Folly Brook Boulevard
Wethersfield, CT 06109

Sandra Leimer
Occupational Therapy Association
6000 Executive Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20852

Adrian Levy
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
99 Washington Avenue
New York, NY 10004

Thomas Long
MELRS
Division of Special Education
Building #6
Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305

Dr. Lewis Loudermilk
Director
West Virginia State Department of Vocational Education
Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305

Al Lowenthal
AFT
Department of Legislation
11 DuPont Circle
Washington, DC 20036

Reed J. Landry
Department of Industrial Education
Texas A & M
College Station, TX 77843

Dr. Martin Lavor
Senior Legislative Associate
Committee on Education and Labor
Room 2100
Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Maxine Lain
Education Service Center Region XIII
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, TX 78731

Dr. Al Lampe
Department of Vocational Education
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05401

Dr. Ron Lutz
Department of Industrial Ed.
202 Wightman Hall
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859

Melvin Ladson
Coordinator of Regional Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

William McCahill
Industry and Labor Council
White House Conference
1832 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Sidney R. McClure
5938 Montgomery Road
Elkridge, MD 21227

Mary McCammon
Employment Security Division
P.O. Box 2981
Little Rock, AR 72203

Lorella McKinney
Center for Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

John W. McGrath, Ex. Secy.
Bureau of Employment Security
Room E-161
Seventh and Forster Streets
Harrisburg, PA 17121

Dr. Gary Meers
Special/Vocational Education
105 Bancroft Hall
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NB 68588

Dr. William Mickey
Department of Manpower
500 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dr. Jeanice Midgett
Associate Professor of Special Education
Florida Technical University
Orlando, FL 32816

Clifford B. Miller, Ex. Dir.
Minnesota State Council for the Handicapped
Metro Square
Seventh and Robert Streets
Suite 208
St. Paul, MN 55101

Don Gardner
Blinded Veterans Association
1735 De Sales Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Ronald Murphy
Department of Industrial Education
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99163

Paul Marchand
National Association for Retarded Citizens, Inc.
2709 Avenue E East
Arlington, TX 76011

Dr. Marty Martison
CORRC Project
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Elizabeth Marten
Girls Scouts U.S.A.
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Marty Martison
CORRC Project
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Bill Meeker
Handicapped Workers Task Force
Employment Standards Administration
U.S. Department of Labor, N-3402
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Betty Mathews
Missouri Division of Employment Services
421 East Dunklin
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Jerry Newman
National Inst. for Occup. Safety and Health
Robert Taft Lab
Columbia Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45226

Dr. Barbara O'Connor
Department of Communication
California State University
Sacramento, CA 95819

Dr. Gerald Ognibene
Special Needs Personnel
Glassboro State University
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Kathleen Olson, Ex. Dir.
Kinkhead Building Fifth Floor
505 East King Street
State Capitol Complex
Carson City, NV 89710

Hedy Oswald
Director
Selective Placement
Civil Service Commission
1900 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Joseph Owens, Ex. Dir.
Council of State Administration of Vocational Rehabilitation
Suite 836
1522 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Yoji Ozaki
Coordinator
Industrial Institute for Development Disabilities
1640 W. Roosevelt Road
Chicago, IL 60608

Dr. Al Phelps
Aide to States
U.S. Office of Education
BEH
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Susan R. Phillips
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Grady Porter
Physical Education
Rehabilitation Consulting
109 East 10th
Austin, TX 78701

Dr. Albert J. Riendeau
Chief, Post-Secondary and Adult Occupational Program Branch
U.S. Office of Education
7th and D Street, SW
Room 5130
Washington, DC 20202

Charles Richman
Director
Association of Rehabilitation Facilities
5530 Wisconsin Avenue, NW
Suite 955
Washington, DC 20015

Dr. Leroy Reynolds
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48808

Dr. Allen Rosebrock
Director
Secondary Teachers of the Handicapped
Rutgers State University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Phenizee Ranson
U.S. Department of Labor
ETA
1371 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, GA 30309

Kathy Roy
Senate Labor and Pub. Welfare Committee
Russell Senate Office Building
Room 352
Washington, DC 20510

Martha Redden
Director
Project on the Handicapped in Science
AAAS
Office of Opportunities in Science
1776 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

James Reid
National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education
1510 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Donald L. Rathbun
Executive Director
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Ellis Reida
Executive Director
Rehabilitation International
20 West 40th Street
New York, NY 10018

Charles Radcliff
Minority Counsel
Commiittee of Education and Labor
2179 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20215

Warren Rockhill
State Supervisor of Special Programs
Job Service of Iowa
1000 E Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50219

Frank Risch
EPI-HAB
V.A. Wadsworth Hospital Center
Wilshire and Sawtelle Boulevard
Building 220
Los Angeles, CA 90073

Richard Ressurreccion
Industrial Studies Department
California State University
55151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Joie Stuart
Handicapped Workers Task Force, ESA
U.S. Department of Labor-S3318
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Tom Swift
State Director Vocational Education
S.E.A.
204 Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Irene Swift
Vocational Education
S.E.A.
204 Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Dr. Stuart Schwartz
Department of Special Education
University of Florida
43 Norman Hall
Gainsville, FL 32601

Merle Strong
Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Ray Sankovsky
Auburn University
216 Peatrie Hall
Auburn, AL 36830

Dr. Jack Schuetz
Director of Special Education
Kern High School District
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Tony Suazo
The President's Committee on
Employment of the Handicapped
Office of State Relations
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Dr. Thomas Sunnarbarg
Director, Business and Industry
Vocational Education
Teacher Program
Bermidji University
Bermidji, MN 56601

Joan Sheldon
Veterans Administration
National Office
Veterans Administration Building
Vermont at H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20420

Ruth Sablowsky
Director
Research of Educational Training
Rehab Group, Inc.
3110 Columbia
Arlington, VA 22044

Mary Santin, Ex. Secy.
Nebraska Governor's Committee on EH
Nebraska Department of Labor
Division of Employment
550 South 16th
State House Station
Lincoln, NB 68509

David Sapp
Box K
Hillsboro, ND 58045

Glee Saunders
U.S. Office of Education
BEH
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Dr. Walter Savoy
Director of Career Education
for the Handicapped
P.G. County Schools
Upper Marlboro, MD 20870

Joseph Scelfo
Ocean County Vocational and
Technical School
Old Freehold and BeyLea Road
Toms River, NJ 08753

Frederick C. Schreiber
Executive Director
National Association of the Deaf
814 Thayer Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. Richard Scott
University of South Florida
FAO 226
School of Education
Tampa, FL 33620

Dr. Richard Scribner
Department of Special Education
St. Cloud State University
St. Cloud, MN 56301

Judy Sello
OSHA Suite
Georgetown Law Center
Institute for Public Inter.
Rep.
600 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Donald Selwyn
Executive Director
National Institute for
Rehabilitation and Engineering
Pompton Lakes, NJ 07442

Dr. Frank Sharkey
Associate Professor
Occupational Education
State University at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14214

Carl Shawhan
Program Development and Eval.
Rehabilitation Placement
Specialist Program
Drake University
Des Moines, IA 50311

Richard Sheppard
The President's Committee on
Employment of the Handicapped
Office of State Relations
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Lamar Shields
U.S. Department of Commerce
Room 5108
14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20230

Dr. Silas P. Singh
Governor's Committee on the
Handicapped
623 East Monroe
Springfield, IL 62701

Jack M. Sink
413 Aderhold
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Peggy Sothoron
Parkdale Senior High School
6001 Good Luck Road
Riverdale, MD 20804

Ron Stroud
Opportunity Center, Inc.
3030 Bowers Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

Herbert A. Start
Director
Pine Rest Christian Rehabilitation
Services, Inc.
6850 South Division Avenue
Grand Rapids, MI 49508

Barbara Scheiber
Closer Look
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Marsha Stevens
Suite 14-C
770 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02199

Stanley Stocker
Chief Counseling and Rehabilitation
Sec.
Veterans Administration Regional
Office
31 Hopkins Place
Baltimore, MD 21201

Robert Stourey
Program Specialist
Vocational Education
West Virginia State Department
of Education
Building #6 - Room 315 B
Charleston, WV 25305

Dr. Austin VanderSlice
Chairman
Sociology Department
American University
Washington, DC 20016

Shirley Sklar
Handicapped Program Administration
IBM
Old Orchard Road
Armonk, NY 10504

Dr. Tim Wentling
125 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Lloyd Tindal
Center for Studies in Voc. and
Tech. Education
321 Education Building
Box 49
Madison, WI 53706

Charles Wrobel, Director
Project Serve
Special Needs Program
330 Century Boulevard
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Michael Ward
Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 02299

Leonard Weitzman
Vocational Rehabilitation Center
Allegheny County
1324 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburg, PA 15219

Dr. George J. Wilkerson
Director of Special Projects
Austin Community College
P.O. Box 2165
Austin, TX 78707

Joseph Wiggins
Virginia Commission for the Visually Handicapped
1029 Ridge Top Road
Richmond, VA 23229

Dr. William Wargo
Associate Professor
Industrial Arts
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Fl 32306

Claude Whitehead
Research and Evaluation
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Bernard Posner
Executive Director
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Edward Rose
Deputy Executive Director
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Paul Hippolitus
President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Washington, DC 20210

Edmond J. Leonard
Program Director
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Ruth Ellen Ross
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Office of State Relations
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Mary C. Rubin
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Office of Programs
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

Larry Volin
The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Office of State Relations
1111 20th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20210

**Planning Committee Members for National Forum on Pathways to Employment**

Marsha Stevens
Chairperson
Committee on Youth Development
President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped
Washington, DC 20210

Mr. Larry Barber
Voc. and Tech. Ed. Service Unit
Disadvantaged and Handicapped
State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 928
Lansing, MI 48904

Dr. Ray Sankovsky
216 Peatrie Hall
Auburn, AL 36830

Mr. Charles Wrobel, Dir.
Project Serve
Special Needs Program
3300 Century Boulevard
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Mr. Fred Weintraub
Council for Excep. Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Dr. Ron Lutz
Department of Ind. Ed. and Tech.
202 Wightmen Hall
Central Michigan University
Mt. Pleasant, MI 48859

Mr. Frank Gentile
Human Resources Center
Albertson, NY 11507

Mr. Joseph Mills
State Director of Voc. Ed.
Division of Voc. Ed.
State Dept. of Education
204 Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Mr. Thomas Swift
Director of Special Needs
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
204 Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Mr. Stanley W. Stocker, Chief
Counseling and Rehab. Section
Veterans Admin. Regional Office
31 Hopkins Place
Baltimore, MD 21201

Mr. William Eddy
Mid-East Regional Resource Center, Suite 505
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Mr. James Reed
American Vocational Association
1510 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Mr. Charles Radcliff
Minority Counsel
Committee on Education and Labor
2179 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20215

Mr. Edward F. Holden, V.P.
N. American Reinsurance Corp.
245 Park Avenue
New York, NY 11017

Dr. William D. Halloran
Bureau of Ed. for the Handicapped
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, Dc 20202

Dr. Harold Perry, Director
Division of Special Education
Memphis City Schools
2597 Avery Avenue
Memphis, TN 38112

Mr. Lawrence Smedley, Asst. Dir.
Social Security Department
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Mr. Lowell Harris
Coordinator for the Mentally Handicapped
Division of Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Const.
Raleigh, NC 27611

Mr. James Snyder, Director
Industrial Arts
Division of Industrial Arts
Capitol Complex, B-318
Charlestown, WV 25305

Mr. Oscar Gjernis
U.S. Employment Service
Patrick Henry Building
Room 8118
U.S. Dept. of Labor
Washington, D.C. 20210

Mr. Ronald Stroud, Ex. Dir.
Opportunity Workshop
3030 Bower
Wilmington, DE 19802

Mr. James Crowder
Assistant to the V.P. of Industrial Relations
Garrett Corporation
9851 Sepulveda Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90009

Dr. Lloyd Tindal
Center for Studies in Voc. and Tech. Education
321 Education Building
Box 49
Madison, WI 53706